REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND:GEF Trust Fund/LDCF

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Increasing resilience of ecosystems and vulnerable communities to CC and anthropic threats through a ridge to reef approach to BD conservation and watershed management		
Country:	Haiti	GEF Project ID:	5380
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4648
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment	Submission Date: Resubmission Date:	April 5, 2013 Feb 9, 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity, Climate Change	Project Duration (Months):	60
Name of parent program (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee ($):	867,832

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
CCA-1: Reducing Vulnerability	1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks 1.2: Reduced vulnerability to CC in development sectors 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income	1.1.1: Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks 1.2.1: Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened 1.3.1: Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened	LDCF	3,844,264	18,050,000
CCA-3: Adaptation Technology Transfer	3.1: Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology 3.2: Enhanced enabling environment to support adaptation-related technology transfer	3.1.1: Relevant adaptation technology transferred to targeted groups 3.2.1: Skills increased for relevant individuals in transfer of adaptation technology	LDCF	1,281,421	6,100,000
BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new PAs. 1.2: Increased revenue for PA systems to meet total expenditures required for management	1. 2 new PAs covering 59,151[1] ha of unprotected ecosystems and 1 new Managed Marine Area covering 40,732ha within an existing National Park. 3. Sustainable financing plans (3).	GEFTF	3,574,380	16,150,000
		Sub-Total		8,700,065	40,300,000
		Project Management	LDCF	256,285	1,296,145
			GEFTF	178,718	903,855
		Total Project Cost		**9,135,068**	**42,500,000**

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK:

Objective: to enhance the resilience of vulnerable ecosystems to the impacts of climate change in PAs and surrounding landscapes , and thereby to secure their biodiversity and ecosystem functionality and derivative ecosystem services including greenhouse gas sequestration and emissions reduction.

[1] 49,471ha MMA in Complex 2 (SW) and 10,504ha in Complex 3 (SE). The 40,372ha Three Bays NP in Complex 1 was established prior to project startup.

<table>
<tr><th>Project Component</th><th>Grant type</th><th>Expected Outcomes</th><th>Expected Outputs</th><th>Trust Fund</th><th>Indicative Grant Amount ($)</th><th>Indicative Co-financing ($)</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased resilience to climate threats in key watersheds and coastal ecosystems.</td>
<td>TA INV</td>
<td>Watershed management practices that contribute to CC resilience and to reducing upstream-downstream impacts are applied by 75% of the target households[2]:
<table>
<tr><td>Complex</td><td>Households</td></tr>
<tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>284,250[3]</td></tr>
<tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>12,600[4]</td></tr>
<tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>10,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>306,850</td></tr>
</table>
Additional areas of ecosystems of critical importance for EBA that have been actively restored:
<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Complexes (ha)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1 NE</td><td>2 SW</td><td>3 SE</td><td>Total</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mangroves (ha/km[5])</td><td>3.5</td><td>3</td><td>0.5</td><td>7</td></tr>
<tr><td>Gulleys (m)</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reforestation</td><td>750</td><td>500</td><td>750</td><td>2,000</td></tr>
</table>
Improvements in climate change resilience among men and women in target communities, as measured by participatory assessments (e.g. IIED CRISTAL or Tear Fund methodologies, to be confirmed at project start)

All Municipal and Departmental governments in the target complexes have spatial land use plans that incorporate EBA/CC considerations</td>
<td><u>Output 1.1 Governance framework—policies, plans and decision making for EBA</u>
a) Incorporation of EBA considerations into national plans and policies
b) Definition of arrangements for inter-institutional collaboration and responsibilities
c) Strengthened capacities for negotiated and coordinated environmental decision-making through:
(i) Incorporating EBA considerations in existing platforms for multi-stakeholder decision-making
(ii) Improved mechanisms for information flow to environmental decision-making processes
d) Territorial land use plans, taking into account spatial variations in CC vulnerability and EBA potential
e) Plans for environmental management and investment

<u>Output 1.2 Conservation and effective management of ecosystems to enhance resilience and functionality</u>
a) Models for CC-resilient NRM practices developed and applied at site level
b) Utilizing community-based structures for planning and implementing EBA and watershed management
c) Strengthened organizations and norms for environmental governance at local level

<u>Output 1.3 Assisted rehabilitation to recover ecosystem functionality</u>
- Restored mangroves along 10m-wide coastal strip
- Community woodlots, enrichment planting, windbreaks, rehabilitation of shade coffee and cocoa, fruit</td>
<td>LDCF</td>
<td>5,125,685</td>
<td>24,150,000</td>
</tr>
</table>

[2] The total numbers of target households give the value for CCA TT indicator 1 (Numbers of people who receive direct assistance aimed at reducing their vulnerability)

[3] 18,000 client households of USAID Avansé Project, 262,500 client households of the World Bank RESEPAG project and 3,750 client households of the IFAD PPI2 project (75% of the estimated client households of each partner project that coincide with the project target area)

[4] 75% of the client households of IFAD PPI3 project in the target area.

[5] 1ha of mangrove reforestation, in a 10m-wide coastal strip, will benefit 1km of coastline.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>trees in soil conservation structures with fruit trees
- Gully stabilisation</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Establishment and management of Managed Marine Areas in the marine and coastal zones of target watersheds</td><td>TA</td><td>Area of coral reef, mangroves or sea grass beds in target coastal and marine areas maintained at least at the current level of 36,600ha

Increased populations of fish on coral reefs, including herbivores of importance for maintaining the health of coral reefs

Coverage of coastal and marine ecosystems (coral reefs, mangroves and seagrass beds) that have been declared and gazetted as protected areas (marine managed areas)[6]
<table><tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Areas by complex (ha)</td></tr><tr><td>Ecosystem</td><td>1 NE</td><td>2 SW</td><td>3 SE</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>Coral reef</td><td>1,503</td><td>2,000</td><td>100</td><td>3,603</td></tr><tr><td>Mangroves</td><td>5,559</td><td>2,050</td><td>50</td><td>7,659</td></tr><tr><td>Sea grass</td><td>8,640</td><td>14,000</td><td>1,500</td><td>24,140</td></tr><tr><td>Others</td><td>25,030</td><td>31,421</td><td>8,030</td><td>64,481</td></tr><tr><td>Totals:</td><td>40,732</td><td>49,471</td><td>9,680</td><td>99,883</td></tr></table>
Internal management zoning (covering 45,497ha) defined within all target PAs.

Reductions in METT threat levels in target PAs:
<table><tr><td></td><td colspan="2">Threat level</td></tr><tr><td>Complex</td><td>Baseline</td><td>Target</td></tr><tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>67</td><td>44</td></tr><tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>52</td><td>29</td></tr><tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>53</td><td>32</td></tr></table>
Increases in METT management effectiveness ranking in target PAs:
<table><tr><td></td><td colspan="2">Threat level</td></tr><tr><td>Complex</td><td>Baseline</td><td>Target</td></tr><tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>10</td><td>49</td></tr><tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>5</td><td>48</td></tr><tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>5</td><td>48</td></tr></table></td><td><u>Output 2.1 Refined proposals for the PA estate in the MCZ</u>
a) Declaration of Managed Marine Areas (MMAs) in all three target complexes
b) Internal zoning of PAs
c) Detailed studies of environmental and social baselines, including climate change impacts

<u>Output 2.2 Strengthened instruments and capacities for the effective management of PAs</u>
a) Definitions of management provisions and corresponding management instruments
b) Programme for training and strengthening local organizations
c) Institutional strengthening programme at national level for PAs
d) Financial mechanisms to support PA management
e) Environmental education, training and awareness raising

<u>Output 2.3 Alternative livelihood options to reduce pressures on coastal and marine biodiversity</u>
a) Alternative livelihood options to reduce pressures on coastal and marine biodiversity developed and applied at site level, including irrigated agriculture, honey production, iguana farming, tourism, aquaculture, horticulture and plastic recycling
b) Community-based structures for planning and implementing alternative livelihood options
c) Strengthened organizations and norms at local level to support alternative livelihood options</td><td>GEFTF</td><td>3,574,380</td><td>16,150,000</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Sub-Total</td><td></td><td>8,700,065</td><td>40,300,000</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4"></td><td>LDCF</td><td>256,285</td><td>1,296,145</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Project Management Cost</td><td>GEFTF</td><td>178,718</td><td>903,855</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Total Project Costs</td><td></td><td>9,135,068</td><td>42,500,000</td></tr>
</table>

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME ($)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount ($)

[6] The areas in Complex 1 are those of the proposed MMA inside the Three Bays National Park (the NP itself was declared before project start). The target areas in the other complexes refer to completely new proposed PAs.

National Government	Ministry of Environment	In kind	200,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment	Cash	1,000,000
Multilateral agency	Interamerican Development Bank	Cash	16,900,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	Cash	3,000,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development - World Bank	Cash	9,000,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development - USAID	Cash	11,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	400,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	1,000,000
Total Co-financing			**42,500,000**

TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNDP	LDCF	CC	Haiti	5,381,970	511,287	5,893,257
UNDP	GEF TF	BD	Haiti	3,753,098	356,545	4,109,643
Total Grant Resources				9,135,068	867,832	10,002,900

D. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	*Grant amount ($)*	*Co-financing ($)*	*Project total ($)*
Local consultants*	792,500	3,170,000	3,962,500
International consultants*	366,000	1,464,000	1,830,000
Total	1,158,500	4,634,000	5,792,500

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

A.1 National Strategies and Plans:

1. The project remains fully aligned with relative national strategies and plans, as described in the PIF.

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:

2. No change in relation to the PIF.

A.3 The GEF agency's comparative advantage:

3. No change in relation to the PIF.

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

4. The three target PA/watershed complexes proposed in the PIF remain the same. Their precise boundaries have been defined during the PPG phase, the criterion for this definition being the boundaries of political units (communes) containing hydrological basins with proven CC vulnerability issues draining into corresponding stretches of coastline facing threats to their biodiversity and their ability to provide Ecosystem-Based Adaptation (EBA) services. The

relevance of this approach was reviewed and confirmed during the PPG phase by mapping the spatial flows of environmental impacts and services within and between the drainage basins and adjacent coastal and marine areas.

5. The baseline analysis was updated and significantly expanded, in light of the major levels of evolving activity on the part of national institutions and international agencies.

6. The most significant change in relation to the baseline situation of the PA system was the fact that the Three Bays National Park, which was proposed in the PIF, was established by the Government (with support from the IDB) during the PPG phase of this project. The targets for PA establishment have been modified accordingly.

A.5 Incremental/additional cost reasoning

7. There are no significant changes to the overall incremental/additional cost reasoning relative to that presented in the PIF. The following modifications have however been made to the proposed outputs:

- The PIF proposed that the project would support the development and adoption by the MoE of formalized and effective procedures for Environmental Impact Assessment, and the corresponding training of MoE staff in the development of terms of reference and in the review of Environmental Impact Statements. The direct support to EIA and SEA mechanisms that was foreseen in the PIF will no longer be necessary given that this will be directly addressed by the European Union AP3C project; the project will however complement the AP3C project by supporting the flow and management of information and lessons learnt among regional and municipal governments in the target areas, in support of the incorporation by them of CC resilience considerations into their environmental decision-making and planning processes.
- An additional item has been added to Output 2.2, relating to environmental education, training and awareness raising, given that limited awareness of the importance and value of coastal and marine ecosystems, and limited levels of human resource capacities in relation to their management, were identified as additional key barriers to their effective and sustainable conservation.
- An additional Output (2.3 Alternative livelihood options to reduce pressures on coastal and marine biodiversity) has been added to Component 2, in recognition of the need for the project to support not only productive options that serve to increase the resilience of livelihoods and natural resource management (under Component 1), but also others that provide alternatives to activities such as fishing, and so are of primary relevance to the reduction of threats to biodiversity and PAs under Component 2. In addition to the direct adaptation benefits of diversified livelihoods, and the biodiversity benefits of reduced fishing pressure, such alternative livelihood options would also have indirect adaptation benefits by protecting coastal ecosystem services that buffer communities from disasters intensified by climate change.

8. The following modifications have been introduced in relation to impact measurements and targets:

- The PIF target under Component 1 of increasing the areas of mangroves, coral reefs and sea grass beds has been modified to one of maintaining their area; this would result from a slowing of the current rates of loss, as a result of reductions in threats (from e.g. overfishing and algal growth, mangrove felling for charcoal, and sediment runoff from watersheds), together with the assisted rehabilitation proposed under Output 1.3.
- Cost calculations carried out during the PPG phase have resulted in a revision of the targets for assisted rehabilitation under Output 1.3. The proposed targets would be achieved with 40% of the total budget available for Component 1, in order to leave sufficient budget available for the other outputs under this Component. A direct comparison between the PIF target and the targets proposed now, broken down by rehabilitation type, is not possible because of the differences in measurement units (ravine stabilisation is measured in length rather than area).
- The PIF target of 200,000ha benefiting from improved protection as a result of ecosystem rehabilitation has not been included in the results framework, nor has the PIF outcome related to reduced economic losses been use as an indicator; while it holds true that these benefits are still expected to result from the project, the monitoring specialist on the PPG team concluded that they are not practical to monitor.
- The indicative target in the PIF, for an increase by around 110,000ha in the coverage of coastal and marine ecosystems declared and gazetted as protected areas, has been modified. The total area of PAs in the three target complexes, expected at the end of the project, is 135,129ha; however IDB support in parallel with the PPG phase has resulted in 75,618ha being declared prior to project start (the Three Bays National Park), meaning that the new areas attributable to this project will in fact be 59,151ha, consisting of the two Managed Marine Areas (MMA) in Complexes 2 and 3; in addition, the project will result in the creation of an MMA covering

40,732ha within the existing Three Bays National Park, giving a total area of MMAs amounting to 99.883ha. The project will in addition result in the internal zoning of the PAs (a total of 45,497ha of internal zones) and on the strengthening of their management effectiveness.

- The targeted increase of 10% in the METT management effectiveness rating for the target PAs has been increased significantly: the end of project target has now been set at 7.25 times the baseline value (an average per PA of 48.3), against a baseline average of 6.7. This revised target was based on a review of each variable in turn, and reflects that two of the PAs have not yet been declared and none have any significant management resources.

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:

RISK	RANKING	MITIGATION STRATEGY
Climate change, resulting in changed/increased pressures on marine and coastal ecosystems, for example due to sea level rise and increased frequency/intensity of storm events.	Medium	The project's emphasis on conserving mangroves will confer benefits on marine and coastal ecosystems in general, due to the buffering and stabilizing effect these have in the face of sea level rise and storm impacts. Through its support to PA design and territorial land use planning the project will ensure that PAs and other spatial units within the landscape provide for CC-related changes, for example by designating zones into which ecosystems such as mangroves (whose limits are naturally defined by sea level and salinity thresholds) can migrate as these thresholds move upwards and inland.
Policy support for economic development initiatives at the expense of natural resource and biodiversity conservation	Medium	A central feature of the design logic of the project is the demonstration to policy makers and planners of how economic development, livelihood support and the conservation of natural resources and biodiversity can be made compatible, and the creation of the mechanisms and capacities required to put this into practice.
Weak institutional capacities for planning, management and governance in the target PAs and watersheds.	Medium	The project will invest in filling key capacity gaps: risk will further be reduced by involving multiple actors in supporting watershed management and BD conservation, including (as complements to the relevant entities within MDE and other relevant sector ministries), NGOs, private development organisations and community-based organisations.
Limited capacity, commitment and/or governance among local people in the target PAs and watershed.	Medium	The project will work in a participatory manner with local communities to discuss and define the strategies to be implemented at local levels, in order to maximize the likelihood of ownership and uptake. It will also work as closely as possible with, and strengthen, community-level governance structures.

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed initiatives:

9. The project will build upon, and be closely coordinated with, **GEF/UNDP project 3616 "Establishing a Financially Sustainable National Protected Areas System"**, the objective of which is that by June 2014, Haiti will have put in place an integrated operational and financial framework to ensure long term sustainability of the national PA system. That project will develop capacities and mechanisms to increase and diversify funding for the NPAS, ensure that the best use is made of the resources available, and realize the potential of local communities to participate in PA management: it will also lead to an increase in the area of the national PA estate in order to improve economies of scale and to develop models of income generation, which will incidentally contribute to the ecosystem coverage of the NPAS. The present project will overlap with project 3616 by around one year. By the time the project starts, project 3616 will have made significant progress in consolidating the bases for the functioning of the SNAP, including the operational establishment of the National Protected Areas Agency (ANAP) within the Direction of Protected Areas of the MDE (the ANAP will in due course become a semi-autonomous entity), the analysis and identification of strategies for financial sustainability and the negotiated development of models for PA planning.

10. The project will coordinate with and learn lessons from the **LDCF/GEF project 3733 "Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti**". That project operates in the south of Haiti but its area of influence does not directly overlap with that of the

project proposed here (project 3733 extends westward from the town of Marigot, while this project will extent eastward from Marigot to Anse a Pitre). Project 3733 has generated lessons, or potential use to this project, regarding the strengthening of 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.

11. In the south-west, the project will complement the GEF/LDCF/UNEP project "**Ecosystem Approach to Haiti's Cote Sud**", which is expected to be submitted for CEO Endorsement in early 2015. The UNEP project will offer a similarly integrated approach to CC resilience and coastal/marine BD conservation, but there will be no direct overlap (the two projects will coincide geographically in the Departments of Grande Anse and Nippes, but the UNEP project will focus there only on early warning and disaster preparedness, which is not directly addressed by this project).

12. Elsewhere in the country, the project will coordinate with other initiatives supported by GEF and/or executed by GEF agencies. These will include the following:

- The existing **LDCF/FAO full-sized project "Strengthening climate Resilience and Reducing Disaster Risk in Agriculture to Improve Food Security" (GEF ID 3733)**, approved in 2010, will generate important experiences and lessons on climate-resilient agricultural practices, which may be applied in the target watersheds of this project.
- The **GEF/IDB project in support of Macaya National Park**: this covers part of the catchment area of the Aquin and Baraderes target areas, and will therefore help to address land-based threats, most notably sediment-laden runoff affecting coral and other aquatic ecosystems.
- The **GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP)**, implemented by UNDP: opportunities will be developed during the implementation phase for SGP to support the community-level alternative livelihood options proposed under Outputs 1.2 and 2.3, taking advantage of the significant experiences which it has generated to date with the strengthening of local stakeholder groups.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

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

13. The project will engage, at national and regional level, a diverse group of stakeholders that will include (see table below for more details):

(i) Community-based organizations, local development associations and resource users associations (fishermen associations);
(ii) Service providers (NGOs, Environmental Foundations, Government implementing agencies, private development operators and professional associations) that could take the form of contractual services or soft agreement or arrangement (no paid services) as well research institutions involved in the development and delivery of demand driven research and extension;
(iii) Government agencies, including Municipalities and local authorities, in the context of governance, policies, plans, guidance and mainstreaming EBA and resilience into their operations;

14. 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 two more 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.

Sector-based line agencies

15. The Ministry of Environment (MDE) will be the implementing partner and institutional host of the project: the Director of Protected Areas will act as National Project Director, the Project Management Unit will be based in the National Protected Areas Agency (ANAP) within MDE, and project staff will partner closely with MDE counterparts at both central and local levels, being at the same time the main recipient of the institutional strengthening to be carried out by the project. MDE will participate in (and chair) the National Steering Committee (NSC), alongside the Ministries of Agriculture (as co-chair), Tourism, Economy and Finance, Planning and the Interior, and the Haitian Civil Society

Platform for Climate Change. The Ministry of Agriculture, in addition to participating in the NSC, will (both through its rural development projects supported by international cooperation and its Commune Agriculture Offices or BACs) act as project partner in the delivery of technical support to target farmers in relation to the application of CC-resilient resource management practices. Similarly, the Ministry of Tourism will be directly involved in the project's activities in relation to the tourism sector in the target complexes.

Local Government

16. Municipal governments, including local authorities managing communal sections (CASECs and ASECs) in each of the target complexes will be involved in the project through their participation in Regional Technical Advisory Groups (RTAGs), consisting of departmental consultative groups such as the Departmental Resilience Consultative Group in the North-East and Grande Anse (for the Nippes area) and the Departmental Environmental Sector Platform in the South-East. They will also be directly involved in, and targeted by, the project's actions in support of environmental governance and the mainstreaming of BD and CC considerations into land use planning.

Community members

17. Consultation with community members will take place through existing community-based organisations, including groups of producers and/or traders, self-help and community emergency groups, and service provider groups (see Stakeholder Analysis in Section I Part I of the Project Document). These organisations will play the following roles:

- Legitimate interlocutors appointed to act as interfaces between communities and the project, with the local authorities (local elected officials in particular), the natural leaders and notables of the respective communities;
- Active member of local subcommittees in each of the project areas;
- Contribution to the definition of criteria for the distribution of certain benefits, achievements or interventions provided through the landmarks of the project;
- Contribution to the validation of periodic progress reports to the process of implementation of the project in their respective areas and sites; via the designated representatives;
- Conveyor of concerns to the project team, thereby ensuring the proper management of the project in the zones; or if applicable to the sub-steering committee of the project;
- Facilitation of consensus (advocacy) with local communities in conjunction with local authorities about sensitive aspects of the project in light of interventions and/or options for the promotion and implementation of certain decisions in relation to sustainable management of natural resources and the environment;
- Support to gender development and integration;
- Beneficiaries of organizational and technical strengthening activities of the project, particularly in relation to the promotion of livelihood alternatives and the strengthening of environmental governance;
- Member of local municipal supervision platforms.

18. CC-resilient farming and watershed management practices will be identified, prioritized, adapted as necessary and promoted using participatory approaches to technology development and transfer as far as possible, including farmer field schools, farmer experimentation and the documentation and interchange of traditional knowledge. Similarly, PA management will place a strong emphasis on local participation, particularly through the involvement (and revitalization where necessary) of existing CBOs such as the Caracol Bay Surveillance Committee, in order to ensure local relevance, ownership and social sustainability.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels; gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits

19. The environmental and socioeconomic benefits of the project will be closely interlinked. The protection of coastal and marine ecosystems (directly, through the PA strengthening actions proposed under Component 2 and indirectly, through the improved watershed management actions proposed under Component 1) will serve to safeguard their long-term potential to sustain livelihoods in fisher communities located along the coastal zones of the target areas, and to buffer these communities against the impacts of climate change (such as wave impact and sea level rise). The improved management of the watersheds which lie inland from these ecosystems will increase the sustainability of livelihoods in farming communities located in the watersheds, and the resilience of their production systems to the impacts of climate change; it will also reduce the exposure of populations living downstream to environmental threats (related in large part to climate change), such as flash flooding and landslides.

20. The design of the project recognizes the need to combine environmental protection with the satisfaction of the short term livelihood and income needs of impoverished local people. Therefore, rather than attempting an (in the current context of Haiti) impractical and unenforceable exclusive approach to conservation, it will seek to ensure that economic development and livelihood support initiatives are carried out with the minimum of impacts on BD and other natural resources and, where possible, "win-win" options are implemented which allow sound natural resource management to contribute actively to the stability of local people's livelihoods.

21. In accordance with this framework, the concrete socioeconomic benefits to be delivered will be as follows:

- **Increased resilience of farmers to climate change.** As a result of the project, a total of 306,850 farmers, distributed between the three target complexes, will be applying conservation agriculture practices that incorporate specific measures to reduce the vulnerability of the agricultural aspects of their livelihoods to climate change. This in turn will contribute to an increase in farmers' perceptions of the CC resilience of their livelihoods: by the project end all target communities will report improved resilience among men and women relative to the without project situation.
- **Reduced exposure of populations downstream to environmental risk resulting from poor watershed management**, particularly flooding, resulting from the sedimentation of water courses due to erosion upstream, and flash floods resulting from landslides due to deforestation upstream. The magnitude of this benefit is hard to quantify given the stochastic natural of the extreme rainfall events with which these risks are typically associated.
- **Alternative livelihoods for fishers:** the project will seek to reduce the levels of fishing activity in the target areas by supporting the development of alternative livelihood options such as irrigated agriculture, honey production, iguana farming, tourism, aquaculture, horticulture and plastic recycling. As a minimum, this will constitute a social mitigation strategy that will ensure that fishers and their families suffer no net negative impact on their livelihoods as a result of the reduction of fishing levels; in fact, given the imminent collapse of fisheries that is suggested by PPG studies (due to overfishing compounded by climate change), this strategy has the potential to increase livelihood sustainability through the inclusion of alternative and more resilient livelihood support options.
- **Increased sustainability of fishing:** reductions in pressures on fisheries resources, as a result of reductions in the overall numbers of people fishing due to the existence of alternative livelihoods, as well as improved fisheries governance, are expected to result in the recovery of fish populations, in terms of both numbers and average fish size. This is expected to improve the levels and reliability of catches by the remaining fishermen, as well as the unit prices received per fish (compared to the undersized individuals that predominated in the rural fish markets inspected during the PPG phase), resulting in improvements in the stability and levels of their income from fishing.

22. The project will employ a number of strategies aimed at optimizing these socioeconomic benefits:

- Maximization of the participation of local people (including women) in the formulation and implementation of the proposed natural resource management and livelihood substitution strategies, thereby ensuring their compatibility with sociocultural considerations and the functioning of existing livelihood support systems.
- A preferential focus on the promotion of livelihood substitution strategies that provide opportunities for the participation of women, such as small-scale manufacturing, commerce and ecotourism. These options will be targeted in particular at the women who are currently involved in the commerce of fish, and whose livelihoods and power status might otherwise be negatively affected by any reduction in fishing activity.
- Improved EIA (including social aspects) that will help to ensure that economic development initiatives do not undermine natural capital on which local livelihoods depend (e.g. by polluting aquatic ecosystems of importance for fish reproduction)

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

23. The cost-effectiveness of activities under Component 1 will be maximized through partnerships with other initiatives working with farmers and other resource managers in the target areas. While the project will provide some direct training to farmers, its impact in terms of the areas and numbers of farmers covered will be maximised by mainstreaming CC resilience considerations and practices into rural development and technical assistance programmes working in the target areas, through the provision of materials, orientation and data, and the "training of trainers" (the extension agents of these programmes).

24. The active rehabilitation to be supported under Output 1.3 will focus on those options with greatest cost-effectiveness, such as watershed reforestation, gulley stabilisation and mangrove planting (focused on a narrow seaward band in order to maximize the length of coastline benefitting). Each of these will have indirect benefits for significant other areas downstream (in the case of watersheds and gulleys) and inland (in the case of mangroves. Other options considered, but which are not proposed to be supported at this time due to their low cost-effectiveness (and therefore their high opportunity cost), are the establishment of coral nurseries (these have the potential to benefit large indirect areas through larval dispersion, but are very expensive, and reductions in fishing pressure are in any case expected to

result in major improvements in coral status) and sea grass planting (this is also expensive and sea grass beds appear to be relatively stable).

25. The cost effectiveness of protected area management will be ensured by focusing on promoting ownership and participation by local communities in PA planning, management and enforcement (see Section B1 above); this will permit them to complement the resources available to Government PA authorities and NGOs.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETTED M&E PLAN

Project start:

26. A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan. The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including:

a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
b) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
e) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

27. An Inception Workshop report will be a key reference document and will be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Managment Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc... The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared by the Project Coordinator to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

28. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

29. UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of project cycle:

30. The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project:

31. An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

32. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

33. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing:

34. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

M&E workplan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ *Excluding project team staff time*	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF	Indicative cost: $3,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on *output and implementation*	▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ *Excluding project team staff time*	Time frame
ARR/PIR	▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	▪ Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: 30,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	▪ Project manager and team, ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : 30,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ local consultant	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team	Indicative cost per year: 3,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly

PART III: ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT: (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/dd/yyyy)*
José Antonio González Norris	GEF Operational Focal Point	Environment	**09-AUG-2012**

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF criteria for project identification and preparation.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency name	**Signature**	**Date**	**Project Contact Person**	**Telephone**	**Email Address**
Adriana Dinu UNDP/GEF Executive Coordinator		Dec. 19, 2014	Lyes Ferroukhi, EBD Regional Technical Advisor	+507 302-4576	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

SECTION II: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK AND GEF INCREMENT

<table>
<tr><th>Vertical logic</th><th>Indicator</th><th>Baseline value</th><th>Target value</th><th>Means of verification</th><th>Risks</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Project Objective: Watersheds and coastal areas in Haiti are spatially configured and managed to increase the resilience of ecosystems and vulnerable communities to climate change and anthropic threats</td><td>O1. Extent of application of watershed management practices that contribute to CC resilience and to reducing upstream-downstream impacts</td><td>Data from comparable areas suggest that approximately 50% of rural households (HH) typically employ Conservation Agriculture Practices[7] on one or more of their plots, and approximately 40% of actively used fields have them in place[8], but without specific EBA benefits.</td><td>Watershed management practices that contribute to CC resilience and to reducing upstream-downstream impacts are applied by 75% of the target households[9]:
<table><tr><td>Complex</td><td>Households</td></tr><tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>284,250[10]</td></tr><tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>12,600[11]</td></tr><tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>10,000 (subject to confirmation)</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>306,850</td></tr></table></td><td>Household surveys carried out in collaboration with partner institutions and projects in each zone</td><td>Delays in operations of partner projects through which target populations will be reached

Climatic events out of coping range of resource management strategies

Changes in economic conditions beyond coping range of NRM strategies</td></tr>
<tr><td>O2. Areas of coastal and marine ecosystems (coral reefs, mangroves and sea grass beds) in the target complexes of importance for ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change</td><td>Current areas (ha) of coral reefs, mangroves and sea grass beds in the target complexes:

- Coral reef: 4,801ha
- Mangroves: 7,659ha
- Sea grass: 24,140ha
- Total priority ecosystems: 36,600ha
Current annual rates of area loss[12]:

- Coral: 1.3-1.5%</td><td>No loss of area of coral reef, mangroves or sea grass beds.</td><td>Field visits, diver surveys, overflights</td><td>CC-related phenomena (e.g. coral bleaching, storm-related sediment runoff, sea level rise) outside of coping range of strategies</td></tr>
</table>

[7] e.g. live barriers, hedgerows, rock barriers, rock walls, trash contour barriers, soil bunds or embryonic terraces, ravine barriers using wattle construction, contour canals. Under the baseline situation, these practices control erosion but do not contribute to CC resilience, for example by conserving moisture.

[8] These estimates are based on percentages found in a survey by Virginia Tech on the Central Plateau of Haiti, and will be validated at local level at project start

[9] The total numbers of target households give the value for CCA TT indicator 1 (Numbers of people who receive direct assistance aimed at reducing their vulnerability)

[10] 18,000 client households of USAID Avansé Project, 262,500 client households of the World Bank RESEPAG project and 3,750 client households of the IFAD PPI2 project (75% of the estimated client households of each partner project that coincide with the project target area)

[11] 75% of the client households of IFAD PPI3 project in the target area.

[12] Based on overall loss of mangroves in Haiti between 2000 and 2005 of 0.8% (ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a1427e/a1427e07.pdf), and estimated annual loss of coral in the Caribbean as a whole of 1.5% (Hodgson et al. 2002)

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks
		- Mangroves: 0.16% - Sea grass beds: stable			
	O3. Increased populations of fish on coral reefs, including herbivores of importance for maintaining the health of coral reefs	Ranges of fish numbers per 100 m^2 in the three target complexes: - Grouper (>30cm): 0-0.25 - Nassau grouper: 0-0.25 - Grunts/margates: 0-1 - Snapper: 0 - Moray eels: 0 - Butterflyfish: 0-0.25 - Parrotfish (>20cm): 0-0.25	Ranges of fish numbers per 100 m^2 in the three target complexes: - Grouper (>30cm): 1 - Nassau grouper: 0.25-0.5 - Grunts/margates: 1-2 - Snapper: 0.25 - Moray eels: 0.25 - Butterflyfish: 1 - Parrotfish (>20cm): 0.5	Reef surveys by divers	Delays in operations of partner projects through which alternative livelihoods will be provided Inadequate governance conditions in fishing communities Increased pressures on fisheries from external actors and initiatives
1. Increased resilience to climate threats in key watersheds and coastal ecosystems.	1.1 Improvements in climate change resilience among men and women in target communities, as measured by participatory assessments (e.g. IIED CRISTAL or Tear Fund methodologies, to be confirmed at project start)	Baseline to be determined through participatory assessments at project start	All target communities (see definition under indicator O.1) report improved resilience among men and women relative to the without project situation	Participatory assessments (e.g. IIED CRISTAL or Tear Fund methodologies)	Delays in operations of partner projects through which alternative livelihoods will be provided CC, natural disasters and/or economic factors outside of coping ranges of resilience strategies
	1.2 Areas of ecosystems of critical importance for EBA that have been actively restored	Current areas (ha) of coral reefs, mangroves and sea grass beds in the target complexes: See Indicator O.2	Additional areas established through investment in active restoration: - Mangrove restoration: 7ha (along 7km of coastline) - Gulley stabilization: 10.0km - Reforestation: 2,000ha	Registers of restoration activities (directly financed by LDCF resources)	

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks
	1.3 Degree of incorporation of EBA/CC considerations and integrated landscape approach into planning instruments covering areas of importance for EBA and/or particularly vulnerable to CC	None of the Municipal and Departmental governments in the target complexes have spatial land use plans that incorporate EBA/CC considerations	All Municipal and Departmental governments in the target complexes have spatial land use plans that incorporate EBA/CC considerations	Review of zoning plans	Capacities and commitment of Municipal and Departmental Governments
2. Establishment and management of PAs in the marine and coastal zones of target watersheds	2.1 Increase in the coverage of priority coastal and marine ecosystems (coral reefs, mangroves and seagrass beds) that have been declared and gazetted as protected areas (marine managed areas)	Total area of coral reefs, mangroves and seagrass beds included in declared and gazetted PAs at present: - Coral reefs: 1,503ha - Mangroves: 5,559ha - Sea grass beds: 8,640ha - Other ecosystems: 25,030ha - Total: 40,732ha	Total area of coral reefs, mangroves and seagrass beds included in declared and gazetted PAs at project end: - 35,402ha - Additional area included in PAs, by ecosystem: - Coral reef: 2,100ha - Mangroves: 2,100ha - Sea grass: 15,500ha - Total priority ecosystems: 19,700ha - Total all coastal/marine ecosystems: 37,300ha	Coordinates contained in PA declarations	Political support to the MMA concept Community support to the MMA concept
	2.2 Area covered by alternative management or protection categories providing for active integrated management and use	0ha: only one PA (Three Bays NP in Complex 1) has been established, without any internal zoning)	A total of 45,497ha out of 99,883ha of MMAs has been zoned for active management	PA management and zoning plans	Political support to the zoning proposals Community support to the zoning proposals
	2.3 Maintenance of income levels of fisher families (men and women) due to alternative livelihood opportunities and/or improvements in quality and value of fish caught and sold	Baseline to be determined during project through retrospective time line exercises	No fisher families in the target areas suffer reduced incomes as a result of project actions	Retrospective time line exercises in focus group meetings and/or household surveys	Delays in operations of partner projects through which alternative livelihoods will be provided Productivity of fisheries is undermined by external actors or initiatives

<table>
<tr><th>Vertical logic</th><th>Indicator</th><th>Baseline value</th><th>Target value</th><th>Means of verification</th><th>Risks</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td>2.4 Reductions in total threat levels affecting proposed coastal and marine PAs, as measured through the GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)</td><td><table><tr><th>Complex</th><th>Threat level</th></tr><tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>67</td></tr><tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>52</td></tr><tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>53</td></tr></table></td><td><table><tr><th>Complex</th><th>Threat level*</th></tr><tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>44</td></tr><tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>29</td></tr><tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>32</td></tr></table>See ProDoc annex for targets per METT variable</td><td>METT workshops with PA managers</td><td>PAs are subjected to threats not targeted by the project</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.5 Management effectiveness rating of target PAs (including improvements in infrastructure and enforcement), measured through the GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)</td><td><table><tr><th>Complex</th><th>Management effectiveness rating</th></tr><tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>5</td></tr></table></td><td><table><tr><th>Complex</th><th>Management effectiveness rating*</th></tr><tr><td>1 (NE)</td><td>49</td></tr><tr><td>2 (SW)</td><td>48</td></tr><tr><td>3 (SE)</td><td>48</td></tr></table>*See ProDoc annex for targets per METT variable</td><td>METT workshops with PA managers</td><td>Inadequate regulatory and resource commitment by Government

Inadequate buy-in by local communities</td></tr>
</table>

Detail for Indicator O2: Baseline and target areas per complex of coral reef, mangroves and sea grass:

Ecosystem	Baseline				Target			
	1 NE	2 SW	3 SE	**Total**	1 NE	2 SW	3 SE	Total
Coral reef	1,503	2,000	1,298	**4,801**	No reduction			
Mangroves	5,559	2,050	50	**7,659**				
Sea grass	8,640	14,000	1,500	**24,140**				
Total	**15,702**	**18,050**	**2,848**	**36,600**				

Detail for Indicator O3: Baseline and target values per complex of numbers of fish/100m^2

Fish type	Baseline			Target		
	1 NE	2 SW	3 SE	1 NE	2 SW	3 SE
Grouper (>30 cm)	0.25	0	0	1	1	1
Nassau Grouper	0.25	0	0	0.5	0.25	0.25
Grunts/margates	0	1	0.25	2	1	1
Snapper	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	0.25
Moray eels	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	0.25
Butterflyfish	0.25	0	0	1	1	1
Parrotfish (>20cm)	0.25	0	0.25	0.5	0.5	0.5

Detail for Indicator 1.2: Target values for areas (ha) established through active rehabilitation, by complex

	1 NE	2 SW	3 SE	Total
Coral	5.0	5.0	0.5	10.5
Mangroves	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0
Seagrass	2.0	2.0	2.0	6.0
Gulleys (m)	4.0	2.0	4.0	10.0
Reforestation	250.0	500.0	500.0	1,250.0

Detail for Indicator 2.1: Baseline and target values for areas (ha) of ecosystems included in protected areas, by complex[13]

Ecosystem	Baseline				Target			
	1 NE	2 SW	3 SE	**Total**	1 NE	2 SW	3 SE	**Total**
Coral reef	1,503	0	0	**1,503**	1,503	2,000	100	**3,603**
Mangroves	5,559	0	0	**5,559**	5,559	2,050	50	**7,659**
Sea grass	8,640	0	0	**8,640**	8,640	14,000	1,500	**24,140**
Others	25,030	0	0	**25,030**	59,916	31,421	8,854	**100,191**
Totals:	**40,732**	**0**	**0**	**40,732**	**75,618**	**49,471**	**10,504**	**135,593**

Detail for Indicator 2.2: Baseline and target values for areas (ha) covered by zoning categories providing for active integrated management

Ecosystem	**Baseline**				**Target**			
	1 NE	**2 SW**	**3 SE**	**Total**	**1 NE**	**2 SW**	**3 SE**	**Total**
Multiple use	0	0	0	0	6,063	0	0	6,063
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0	300	125	30	455.4
Tourism	0	0	0	0	13,110	14,942	200	28,252
No-Take Fisheries	0	0	0	**0**	4,647	1,464	2,298	8,409
Mangrove Conservation	0	0	0	0	1,714	600	3	2,317
Total management zones	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	25,834	17,131	2,531	45,496
Total MMA	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**40,372**	**49,471**	**9,680**	**99,883**
Non-MMA area	75,618	0	0	75,618	35,246	0	0	35,246
Total PA	**75,618**	**0**	**0**	**75,618**	**75,618**	**49,471**	**9,680**	**135,129**

[13] The areas in Complex 1 are those of the proposed MMA inside the Three Bays National Park (the NP itself was declared before project start). The target areas in the other complexes refer to completely new proposed PAs.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

Responses to STAP Review:

Comments	Responses	Reference in document
1. The STAP encourages the project developers to rely on the following STAP advisory documents to support further the threat analysis on marine coastal zones "Marine Debris as a Global Environmental Problem, Introducing a solutions based framework focused on plastic". 2011. STAP. The document is available at http://www.stapgef.org/international-waters	In line with the STAP document's recommendations, the project will combine awareness raising regarding the problem of plastic debris (through the environmental awareness raising and education programmes proposed under Output 2.2e), with assisting local communities to turn plastic into a usable resource rather than solely a problem, through the promotion of local enterprises based on plastic recycling (under Output 2.3a): such enterprises would yield multiple benefits, through reducing the volumes of plastic present in coastal and marine environments, generating employment and income for local people, and providing livelihood alternatives with potential to reduce their dependence on fishing (thereby reducing fishing pressures on coastal and marine ecosystems).	Section I Part II Strategy: Outputs 2.2e and 2.3a.
2. The proposal recognizes the tremendous challenges to restoring ecosystem function and biodiversity in landscapes that have a long history of degradation, and within some of the poorest communities of the western hemisphere. Of particular importance is the interaction of climate and non-climate stresses, and the manner in which these linkages may change in the future. As mentioned earlier, the underlying socio-economic determinants of vulnerability need to be addressed in a manner that utilizes, and is supportive of ecosystem-based approaches. The human capacity challenges match the environmental constraints and thus the focused approach is strongly supported. STAP welcomes the emphasis on spatial planning and refers the project to the CBD/STAP document - Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29, Montreal, Technical Series No. 68, 44 pages.	The Threats analysis recognizes that the target populations start from a very low baseline in terms of livelihood sustainability: this is a function of their already limited access to most or all of the forms of capital recognized in the sustainable livelihoods analysis framework. Most of the threats to livelihood sustainability associated with climate change will in reality constitute exacerbations of existing threats, many of which are related to baseline climatic variability that will become more pronounced under conditions of climate change. The CC-sensitive Threats analysis portrayed graphically in Figure 2 emphasizes the existence of complex flows of impacts between the different spatial components and stakeholders in the "PA/watershed complexes", and between livelihood support activities, global environmental values and the "natural capital" essential for livelihood sustainability and CC resilience. The ideal situation that will be promoted by the project is one in which it is in the farmer's or fisher's immediate own best interests to address impacts affecting livelihood sustainability or resilience: this is most likely to be the case with vulnerable farmers in upper watersheds, for whom the adoption of resilience measures may confer immediate benefits in terms of resilience to existing climatic variability (and also to longer-term climate change, of which they may be less aware). In other cases, where the impact flows constitute "externalities", and do not necessarily directly (or solely) affect the stakeholders who generate them, in order for any impact-reduction measure to be sustainable it must be made to be in the best interests of the person that generates it: this is the logic behind the focus of the project on identifying and promoting NRM and livelihood support activities that are inherently viable and attractive and do not therefore imply the imposition of costs on the families involved.	Section I Part I (Threats), particularly Figure 2

Comments	Responses	Reference in document
3. Furthermore, STAP encourages UNDP to specify further its ecosystem based adaptation approach based on the spatial attributes of ecosystem services. This could potentially strengthen the design of the components in a way that better accounts for complementarities and trade-offs resulting from ecosystem processes. In particular, the spatial attributes of ecosystem services (where the services are generated and who benefits) could be useful in strengthening the interventions, and outcomes on ecosystem based adaptation. This framework may be useful, given the competing and multiple uses in the targeted watersheds and coastal zones. For further information on an approach targeting landscape services, the project developers may wish to consult the following resource: Syrbe, R. et al. "Spatial indicators for the assessment of ecosystem services: providing, benefiting and connecting areas and landscape metrics". Ecological indicators 21 (2012) 80-88.	The way in which the project applies the approach described by Syrbe et al. is explained in the section on "Conceptual and Analytical Framework" at the beginning of the document, and portrayed in more specific terms in Figure 2, which portrays clearly the spatial attributes of impact flows. The analytical approach presented in the document in fact builds upon that presented by Syrbe et al., introducing the concepts of Impact Generating, Transmitting and Receiving Areas as corollaries to the terms Service Generating, Connecting and Benefitting Areas used in the article. The use of this framework in the threats analysis acknowledges the vital importance of tracking impact flows as a means of checking the relevance of each proposed threat reduction measure; and of identifying needs for possible compensation of the impacts of such measures.	Section I (Conceptual Framework) Section I Part I (Threats), particularly Figure 2
4. Continuing on the element of ecosystem-based adaptation, it is important to clearly delineate two different situations: one where the primary objective is the enhancement / maintenance of ecosystem services (and thereby generate GEB's such as biodiversity conservation) in the face of climate change (i.e. "climate-proofing" of BD conservation measures) from a situation where ecosystem services are used to enhance the resilience of communities and socio-economic systems to climate change. Of course, in the latter situation, GEB's appear as a co-benefit, with climate change adaptation as the primary benefit.	Figure 2 in the ProDoc portrays the respective relevance of impacts for GEBs and CC resilience. In fact, most coastal and marine ecosystems (corals, seagrass beds and mangroves) deliver GEBs (biodiversity) and CC resilience benefits (shoreline protection) simultaneously, so it is not a question of delineating between different situations: the difference between situations is rather one of degree, depending for example on the strategic location of the protective ecosystems relative to human settlements. This in fact presented something of a dilemma when deciding where to place such issues in the project's structure: in the PIF all NRM support activities were placed in Component 1 (LDCF), as these were all foreseen as contributing principally to CCA, however during the PPG phase it became evident that there was also a need to support NRM activities specifically aimed at reducing pressures on biodiversity. Although these would also generate CCA benefits by helping to safeguard the EBA functions of coastal and marine ecosystems, as their prime justification was in terms of BD it was decided to include them in a new output of Component 2. Only in the case of watershed management do situations arise where benefits accrue exclusively in relation to only one of these objectives (specifically, measures to conserve on-farm soil humidity, which only confer CC resilience benefits and only very indirectly could they be considered to generate BD benefits).	Section I Part I (Threats), particularly Figure 2
5. The STAP cautions that regardless of the excellence of a project description, its success on the ground will be dependent on the capacity of local communities to respond effectively to the proposals presented. Capacity refers not only to technical capacity and political will, but also to absorptive capacity for the many interventions proposed. STAP therefore recommends that during PPG, careful assessment of all capacities within	A detailed identification and characterization of local stakeholder institutions was carried out by the PPG consultant specializing in participation and gender analyses. The results of these analyses, which included a number of participatory workshops (see Annex IV of the Project Document for the institutions identified) are presented in the stakeholder analysis section of the Project Document. This analysis sets out the perspectives of the individual fishers and farmers regarding their	Section I Part I (Stakeholder Analysis)

Comments	Responses	Reference in document
local communities be evaluated, and where possible 'participation fatigue' be avoided by adopting a slow and incremental approach to implementation.	needs and the effectiveness of their organisations (see Boxes 4 and 5) and analyses of the capacities of the organisations themselves (paragraphs 229-231). This recommendation has been reiterated in the text of the Project Document, particularly in relation to Output 1.1c, which refers to permanent multi-stakeholder platforms: the recommendation in that case is to rely as much as possible on using existing platforms rather than fatiguing local stakeholders by expecting them to participate in new ones. Wherever possible local consultations, workshops and training events will also seek to maintain the target audiences' motivation to participate by focusing on concrete solutions of relevance to specific and immediate problems identified by the communities, rather than the more abstract aspects of EBA and BD conservation. In relation to CC resilience strategies in upland agriculture, for example, the project may emphasize the need to address business-as-usual problems of vulnerability to short term climate variability, to which farmers can easily relate, rather than long term climate change, which may be more difficult for them to relate to, but which may in many cases be addressed through virtually the same technical solutions.	Section I Part II (Strategy): Output 1.1c
6. The STAP suggests detailing what target areas each component will focus on. Currently, the proposal appears to be more explicit in this regard for component 1 and its link to "The Three Bays", and less so for component 2 and the remaining target areas.	The greater emphasis that was placed on the Three Bays complex in the PIF simply reflected the larger amount of information that was available on that area at that time, without having had access to PPG resources to generate such information on the other areas. Detailed field studies and analyses carried out during the PPG phase did generate more detailed and balanced information on the other sites, and served to confirm the initial selection of target sites.	Section I Part I (Target Complexes)
7. The STAP appreciates the efforts made to define the reasoning for the additional cost, and identify the adaptation benefits. In particular, it is pleased to see the proposal aims to contribute to improve "the indices of ecosystem health and environmental services in key areas of ecosystems of importance for ecosystem based adaptation..." In this regard, STAP encourages UNDP to establish explicit links between how ecosystem health (restoration/conservation) has supported the provision of ecosystem services and reduced climate change vulnerability among the target populations. Doing so will contribute to strengthening the additional cost reasoning, and build the evidence on the effectiveness of ecosystem based adaptation.	The impact flow chart (Figure 2) and the impact flow maps show clearly the differentiated implications of each of the identified threats to ecosystem health, in terms of climate change vulnerability: for example, low levels of soil cover and organic matter increase exposure of farmers to periodic droughts, and degradation of reefs and mangroves increases the exposure to coastal settlements and productive capital to wave impacts and sea level rise. Combatting these phenomena will conversely promote the provision of ecosystem services in terms of CC buffering ("ecosystem-based adaptation").	Section I Part I (Threats), particularly Figure 2
8. Furthermore, STAP encourages the project developers to identify indicators to estimate and monitor adaptation benefits. Currently, how the adaptation benefits will be measured and tracked appears absent in the proposal. The identification and use of appropriate indicators assumes even more importance in the light of the aforementioned delineation between ecosystems	The causal mechanisms between ecosystem resilience and socioeconomic vulnerability are explained in the Threats section, and particularly its final subsection on the interactions between climate change, biodiversity and vulnerability. As explained in the Project Document, the principal links between ecosystem status/resilience and socioeconomic vulnerability are as follows:	Project Document Part IB: (Threats)

Comments	Responses	Reference in document
resilience and socio-economic vulnerability to climate change. It is not sufficient to state that simply enhancing ecosystem resilience automatically reduces the socio-economic vulnerability. The causal mechanism needs to be fully spelt out, together with the right metrics to establish the linkages.	- Reductions in the area and/or conditions of mangroves due to the recession of their seaward edges under conditions of SLR will affect fish populations, which depend on mangroves for reproduction, spawning and/or grow-on. Fisheries are currently the mainstay of the local economy in coastal and marine zones of the target complexes, so this has direct implications for local livelihoods, not only reducing income levels but also narrowing the livelihood support options available to local people and thereby reducing the diversity and therefore resilience of their livelihoods as a whole. - The degradation of coral reefs, which have strong ecological links with mangroves in terms of their importance for fish populations, will have similar implications. - Both of these ecosystems, together with sea grass beds, also play vital physical roles in buffering the impacts of climate change on local people in the coastal and marine zone, by absorbing wave energy under conditions of CC-related sea level rise and increased storm frequency. - The CC resilience of terrestrial farming systems, and therefore of farming-based livelihoods, is strongly dependent on the role of the vegetative components of agricultural ecosystems in i) conserving soil humidity under conditions of CC-related drought; ii) facilitating rainfall and runoff infiltration, thereby reducing CC-related seasonal variability in soil humidity and stream flows; iii) protecting the soil from rainfall impact and erosion under conditions of CC-related storm events; and iv) providing physical binding to the soil, protecting against mass movement under conditions of CC-related storm events. The above processes are direct determinants of the CC resilience not only of the local communities themselves, but also, in the case of watershed (agro)ecosystems, the vulnerability of populations living downstream to extreme high or low river flows and flash floods. On the basis of the above, it is valid to use ecosystem status (Indicator O2), and the extent of application of CC-resilient ecosystem management practices (O2) as proxy indicators for livelihood CC resilience. Indicator O3 (status and composition of fish populations) is also a proxy for indicator for the status ecosystems and therefore the EBA potential of coral reefs. These indicators will be backed up by surveys of farmers' own appreciation of their resilience/vulnerability (Indicator 1.1). The more direct measurement of concrete adaptation benefits among target populations poses challenges due to the unpredictable nature of CC-related events: farmers may in reality be more capable of weathering	

Comments	Responses	Reference in document
	such events, but might conceivably fail to receive any concrete benefits during the project period because no such events actually occurred.	
9. Similarly, STAP recommends defining indicators for the expected global environmental benefits on biodiversity conservation. The STAP welcomes the reference to the biodiversity tracking tool as a way to monitor the performance of the project. Nonetheless, it encourages UNDP to identify explicitly impact indicators in the project framework. This will assist in monitoring the effects of the interventions on the biodiversity global environmental outcomes.	The project will monitor BD benefits at two levels: - Areas of key coastal and marine ecosystems (coral reefs, mangroves and sea grass beds). - Fish populations: these will be both indicators and determinants of overall ecosystem health, given on the one hand the dependence of fish populations on the existence of healthy mangroves, coral reefs and sea grass beds, and on the other the crucial role played by herbivorous fish in maintaining reef health, by grazing algae. Furthermore the Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) is IUCN Endangered and its population status serves as a global BD indicator in its own right.	Section II: Results Framework
10. In terms of climate risks, it is important to clearly distinguish between the risks in upland and mountain systems and risks in the coastal zone. While conceptually it seems to be a good idea to consider the entire chain from the upland to the coastal and on to the nearshore; more careful consideration of the different types of climate change risks (for example sea level rise vs. increased precipitation intensity and flooding) is important. At the same time, the socioeconomic factors determining exposure and vulnerability are also quite different along the "ridge-to-reef". It would have been helpful if the PIF had reflected more clearly this differential vulnerability on pages 7-9, for example.	PPG studies clearly support this observation: the nature and implications of the forms of vulnerability faced by local people, and the threats to their resilience and to the ecosystems that support this resilience, indeed vary widely between different parts of the landscape (e.g. high plateaux, middle altitudes, foothills, coastal plains, coasts and islands). These differences are clearly indicated in the maps of impact flows, and explained in the text. The studies also highlighted the need to avoid excessive conceptual simplicity when characterizing impact flows: for example in many locations the upstream-downstream sedimentation impacts on reefs, so prevalent in popular discourses, appears to be of secondary significance for reef health relative to the overexploitation of herbivorous fish and consequent smothering by algae.	Section I Part I (Threats), particularly Figure 2
11. Finally, the PIF suggests (page 13) that the baseline interventions will emphasize infrastructural interventions as compared to ecosystem-based approaches. However, if the baseline interventions are examined more fully, there appear to be many elements that are complementary or similar to the ideas in the proposed project. In such a situation, it may be better to position the current intervention as a modification of the baseline to generate multiple benefits, rather than a stand-alone set of interventions.	PPG studies have confirmed that there is a solid baseline of investments related to natural resource management. As the reviewer suggests, the main focus of the incremental argument is therefore now on "redirecting the baseline", for example by mainstreaming resilience considerations into agricultural extension programmes for hillside farmers, and introducing resource governance systems into the fisheries sector.	Section I Part II (Strategy): Output 1.2a

Responses to GEFSec Review:

Comments	Responses	Reference in document
For CEO endorsement, GEF Secretariat will require that the "integrated operational and financial framework" for Haiti's National Protected Area System have been established. (This is currently	Please note that the objective of the project "Establishing a financially sustainable National Protected Areas System" (GEF ID 3616) was not that the "integrated operational and financial framework… [would] have been established by June 2014", but rather that "By June 2014 Haiti has ***designed and started initial implementation*** of an integrated operational and financial framework to ensure long term sustainability of the national PA	Section I Part II (Strategy – Coordination with related initiatives)):

targeted to be in place by June 2014, as mentioned in paragraph 78.)	system". The target date should also be viewed in the light of the fact that the operations of Project 3616 were set back by approximately a year due to the earthquake of 2010, as a result of which a no-cost extension has been requested, through the UNDP Regional Centre in Panama. Support provided to date by Project 3616 and (in accordance with the recommendations of its Mid-Term Evaluation) to be provided from now until the end of 2014, will result in the following: - Increased valuation of PAs by key decision-makers (a key requisite for increasing allocation of budgetary resources) due to MDE/ANAP staff and other key decision-makers having participated in study visits to other Caribbean countries, local authorities having participated in regional workshops on PA valuation, and direct lobbying of Members of Parliament and representatives of the Ministries of Finance and Environment. - Harmonization of the actions of the different institutional stakeholders involved in PA management, as a result of workshops organized by ANAP - Medium term bridging support to the ANAP, in the form of human resources and technical capacity development, earmarked from external agencies (including GIZ and IDB), as part of an exit strategy as support from Project 3616 comes to an end. - Increased knowledge of PA issues among staff of the Ministry of Agriculture, in order to facilitate the integration of PA management into that of the surrounding productive landscapes - Consolidation of the Permanent Working Group on Protected Areas in order to ensure interinstitutional coordination and harmonization of approaches. - Progressive increases in the funding of PA personnel in the Three Bays, La Visite and Foret de Pins NPs by the Ministry of Environment/ANAP. - Formalized methodological guidance for PA management, based on systematization of experiences in Macaya NP. - A clear strategic vision on options for financial sustainability of the NPAS (based on studies carried out under Project 3616), including the establishment of the Haitian Environmental Fund (FREH), together with an organic law for the ANAP and the FREH. - A PA surveillance/enforcement group operating, with support from a clear surveillance strategy and corresponding tools. - Concrete collaboration between ANAP, the Ministry of Tourism and ISPAN regarding sustainable tourism in support of PA management. - Training of 200 agents of the Environmental Surveillance Corps in GPS techniques, environmental management practices, and legal aspects of environmental surveillance - Physical boundary marking of Macaya and La Citadelle PAs; similar work will start shortly in Three Bays NP (Complex 1 of this project). Agreements have also reached for the formalisation of technical support from Cuba for the consolidation of the SNAP, with the collaboration of the GEF project; further support is also foreseen from GIZ.	
Please provide confirmation of cofinancing	Co-financing is shown in Table C above. **Sources of Co-financing** | **Name of Co-financier** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Amount ($)**	

	National Government	Ministry of Environment	In kind	200,000	
	National Government	Ministry of Environment	Cash	1,000,000	
	Multilateral agency	Interamerican Development Bank	Cash	16,900,000	
	National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	Cash	3,000,000	
	National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development - World Bank	Cash	9,000,000	
	National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development - USAID	Cash	11,000,000	
	GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	400,000	
	GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	1,000,000	
	Total Co-financing			**42,500,000**	
Please provide additional details on proposed new livelihood support activities which may be put in place to enhance climate resilience.	Details of livelihood support activities are presented in Box 8 of the Project Document. The options proposed are: 1) Irrigated agriculture 2) Honey production 3) Tourism 4) Aquaculture 5) Horticulture 6) Plastic recycling These options have dual potential: to allow fishers to depend less on fishing, thereby reducing fishing-related impacts on coral reefs (contributing simultaneously to biodiversity conservation and the EBA role of reefs) as well as making the fishers' livelihoods more resilient (given the CC vulnerability of fishing); and similarly to allow farmers to depend less on CC-vulnerable rainfed farming systems.			Section I Part II (Strategy): Output 2.3a

Responses to GEF Council Comments:

USA's Comments:	Extensive discussions have been held with IDB throughout the PPG phase, building on the close collaboration and coordination between IDB and GEF/UNDP project 3616 "Establishing a

With a view toward further strengthening this PIF, we ask UNDP, as it prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, to meet with the IDB to clarify (i) the geography and extent of IDB investment in the Three Bays; and (ii) some possible duplication of UNDP-SNAP management planning and sustainable finance planning activities already in their current work plan.	Financially Sustainable National Protected Areas System" (the "SNAP project") leading up to the declaration of the Three Bays National Park and associated capacity building activities. On the basis of these, IDB's investments in the Three Bays are described as follows in the Baseline Analysis section of the Project Document : ***"Support to the Three Bays National Park*** Within the context of its environmental mitigation commitments assumed as a result of its support to the industrial park inland from Caracol Bay, the IDB proposes to support the Three Bays National Park (in Complex 1 of the present project) with three distinct seedling projects, for a total amount of US$1.5 million: - **Project HA-L1055:** support to biological baseline surveys and socio-economic baseline studies for fisheries, mangrove uses and salt use in the areas of Caracol Bay; The development of the management plan which the SNAP project has the lead on will build upon the results of these baseline surveys - **Project HA-L1076:** development of sustainable alternative livelihoods for the improvement of the well-being of local communities while reducing biodiversity threats; - **Project HA-T1180:** building managerial capacity of ANAP and administrative and managerial capacity of the PN3B at the field level, including a physical location near Caracol to administer park management, ranger stations, furniture, floating docks, a boat and motor and associated equipment, and motorcycles. IDB support to PN3B to date has consisted of the following actions: 1. Providing technical assistance to the Government of Haiti (specifically the Technical Execution Unit or UTE of the Ministry of Finance) to establish the legal basis for declaration of the Three Bays National Park the PN3B (October 2013, with an updated declaration in April 2014) to establish.and operationalize (PN3B) 2. Providing technical assistance to the National Agency for Protected Areas of the Ministry of Environment (ANAP) (which was established with support from the SNAP project) to establish a Management Committee (*Comite de Suivi*) for the PN3B consisting of ANAP, Ministry of Environment, UTE, UNDP, and IDB. The *Comite de Suivi* meets regularly and has approved all of the existing and proposed management activities for the PN3B. 3. Providing technical assistance to the UTE to develop and procure consultancy contracts to undertake baseline studies for the Caracol Bay (one of the bays of PN3B) and to plan and implement a program for alternative sustainable livelihoods in Caracol Bay. These projects

	will also finance the salaries of a Park Director, Monitoring Manager, administrative assistant, and community environmental and outreach workers 4. Working with ANAP and UNDP to identify future funding sources for the financial sustainability of the PN3B. The IDB has furthermore worked on the development of a provisional zoning map for the terrestrial areas of the National Park, in association with the Bank's "Sustainable Cities" initiative. The Bank is also planning to support basic infrastructure, equipment, and staffing needs for ANAP to be on the ground in Caracol Bay through 2015. The specific needs identified by ANAP include (i) a physical location near Caracol from which to administer park management, (ii) two ranger stations for education and enforcement to be located at critical entry routes, (iii) furniture and equipment to ensure that the stations are functional, (iv) two floating docks associated with the ranger stations, (v) a boat and motor and associated safety equipment, (vi) a motorbike and an ATV, and (vii) support for monitoring personnel. If additional funds were available, they would be used to complement the alternative sustainable livelihoods activities mentioned in point 3 described above. IDB is in the short term funding local staff, who carry out community liaison and environmental awareness raising. Over the next 2 years, IDB will be providing the following support (through contracts with national companies/NGOs): - $450,000 for environmental awareness raising and community engagement, including the hiring of 30 community level outreach people. - $320,000 for infrastructure and equipment for PA management, including 6 community-based people for environmental monitoring - $110,000 for economic development strategy and business planning, which will result in 4-5 business concepts such as ecocafes, salt production, and the substitution of charcoal with gas for cooking." These discussions during the PPG phase focused on how the new project will build on these initial investments by IDB and the activities of the existing SNAP project, and how IDB and UNDP will coordinate their activities in an incremental manner in the future. IDB clarified that their co-financing support to the Three Bays National Park will be of relatively short duration, including the funding of salaries for park staff for an initial period of two years as a "bridging" measure, and as such will not be sufficient to ensure the operational or financial sustainability of the PA.

	GEF support will therefore complement this IDB support in an incremental manner, focusing on: - The establishment and consolidation of a Marine Managed Area (MMA) as an internal management zone within the overall boundaries of the PA as a whole (Output 2.2a), and "sub-zones" within the MMA (Output 2.2b) in which specific management measures will be promoted to maximize the sustainability of fisheries and other livelihood support activities, and their compatibility with conservation objectives; - Evaluation of the ecological sustainability of proposed livelihood support actions (particularly the Fish Aggregation Devices to be supported by IDB), through the contracting of an international fisheries specialist to carry out evaluation of FAD impacts and design a monitoring system for fish populations (output 2.1c). - The provision of technical and organisational support to local stakeholders, the consolidation of links between Government entities and local communities, and the development/strengthening of natural resource/fisheries governance structures and norms (outputs 2.1 and 2.2), through the funding of community-level facilitation consultants, a full-time PB/BD specialist in each target zone, and contracts with national NGOs/PDOs. GEF funds will also be used in an incremental manner in support of financial sustainability (Output 2.2d), through the contracting of an International PA finance specialist to advise on the implementation of the PA financing strategy, building on the results of project 3616. Otherwise, activities in support of this output will be largely cofinanced by TNC, through the CMBA: key elements of this support, of relevance to the Three Bays National Park, will include the establishment of private sector partnerships to support CMBA; and the regional-level work on a C-Fish Fund, as a MEIF could provide targeted financing for businesses in the Three Bays area.
<u>USA's Comments:</u> Prior to CEO endorsement, the GEF Secretariat should confirm the co-financing for the project, including whether it is properly being accounted as incremental co-finance rather than existing under the baseline project.	The nature of IDB co-financing and its incremental relation to the proposed GEF funds are explained above. The rest of the promised co-financing consists largely of support to rural and agricultural development projects by large funding agencies (IFAD, USAID and the World Bank). This is "redirected baseline" funding: under the baseline scenario these projects would promote natural resource management and livelihood support activities in the target watersheds, but would fail adequately to provide for resilience to climate change, or for upstream-downstream impacts on fragile coastal ecosystems; GEF incremental support would mainstream CCA and BD considerations into these investments, in such a way as not only to reduce their potential negative impacts in terms of CC vulnerability and BD, but to allow them positively to contribute to CC resilience (for example through the introduction of climate-smart agricultural practices and livelihood diversification) and to BD conservation (for example through the promotion of livelihood support activities that will reduce local communities' dependence on environmentally-harmful activities such as fishing).

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

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

None: PPG studies confirmed the target sites and strategies proposed in the PIF.

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: $180,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF Amount ($)***		
	Budget Approved	***Amount Spent to Date***	***Amount Committed***
1. Recommendation of strategies for EBA and NRM	20,000.00	20,000.00	-
2. Policy, planning and institutional analysis	40,000.00	40,000.00	-
3. Proposal of stakeholder participation and social mitigation strategies	25,000.00	25,000.00	-
4. Proposals for PA management	35,000.00	35,000.00	-
5. Proposals for biodiversity conservation in coastal/marine zone	30,000.00	30,000.00	-
6. Development of key project design elements	30,000.00	10,757.12	19,242.88
TOTAL	**180,000.00**	**160,757.12**	**19,242.88**