

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3132	
GEF Agency project ID		HA-X1002	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IADB	
Project name		Sustainable Land Management of the Upper Watersheds of South Western Haiti	
Country/Countries		Haiti	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Land Degradation, and Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD 1: Agricultural and pastoral systems: Maintain or improve flows of agro-ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities LD 2: Forest landscapes: Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in arid zones, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people CC-SO 7: To reduce GHG emissions from land use CC-SO 8: To support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Project partners: Macaya Foundation for Local Development (FMD), New Grande Anse Foundation (FNGA), and Environmental Rehabilitation Organization (ORE)	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		September 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.200	0
	Co-financing	0.150	0
GEF Project Grant		3.44	3.64
Co-financing	IA own	17.25	17.25
	Government	0.400	0
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	3.79

	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		3.64	3.64
Total Co-financing		17.65	21.04
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		21.29	24.68
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2018	
Author of TE		Grégoire Lejonc - Docteur Lucille Palazy	
TER completion date		November 5, 2018	
TER prepared by		Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Ritu Kanotra	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	-	U	-	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		U	-	U
M&E Design		U	-	U
M&E Implementation		U	-	U
Quality of Implementation		MS	-	MS
Quality of Execution		MU	-	U
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is to “address and contain the rapid environmental degradation in the upper watershed of the Southern part of Haiti through the integration of sustainable land and forest management practices at the watershed level. In addition, the project seeks to support forest restoration and implementation of a carbon stock and sequestration monitoring system to enhance the understanding of impacts on carbon sequestration and emissions avoided caused by changes in land use systems and vegetation/forest cover” (CEO Endorsement, page 7).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is to “strengthen local governance on the assumption that the environmental degradation in Haiti is a result of poor managing capacities” (CEO Endorsement, page 7).

The project intended to achieve its objective through four components and they were:

Component 1: Institutional strengthening of local governance -

Output 1.1: Environmental Monitoring Teams (CSE) established and operational;

Output 1.2: Completed community infrastructure projects;

Output 1.3: Macaya infrastructure operational (i.e. administrative center, welcome center, check-points);

Output 1.4 Intercommunal agreement developed and implemented in the buffer zone;

Output 1.5 Environmental education programme implemented in the buffer zone schools;

Output 1.6 Priority activities of the Management Plan implemented.

Component 2: Adoption of sustainable land and forest management -

Output 2.1 Farmers supported by the project;

Output 2.2 Socioenvironmental impact measured;

Output 2.3 Rural roads equipped with runoff collection structures;

Output 2.4 Accompany the private sector to develop strategic value chains.

Component 3: Strengthening of land tenure regulatory framework -

Output 3.1 Park boundaries established;

Output 3.2 Macaya National Park zoning written in law;

Output 3.3 Number of research projects in the park;

Output 3.4 MNNP Management Plan developed and published.

Component 4: Green House Gas emissions and carbon stock monitoring –

Output 4.1 Monitoring of greenhouse gas and carbon stocks in MNNP.

3.3 Were there any changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

After the funding contribution of Haitian Reconstruction Fund (HRF) towards the project, the objective of the project was reformulated to “ensure the protection of Macaya Natural National Park’s (MNNP) natural resources by improving the living conditions of the local populations” (TE, Page 11)

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	----------------------

The project is relevant to GEF’s strategic objectives on land degradation and sustainable land management. The project is consistent with GEF’s LD-1 Agricultural and pastoral systems: Maintain or improve flows of agro-ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities, and LD-2 on Forest landscapes: Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in arid zones, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people. As the project is multi-focal, the project also aligns with strategic objectives of SLM-1 to reduce pressures on forest resources and generate flows of forest ecosystem services, and SLM-2 strengthen the enabling environment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhance carbon sinks from LULUCF activities (TE page 53).

The project is also consistent with Haiti’s Environmental National Action Plan, the National Adaptation Action Plan (2006), the Strategic Planning Document for Poverty Reduction (2007), the National Action Program to Combat Desertification (2009), and the National Risk and Disasters Management Plan (2001) (TE page 54).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------	------------------------

The project had an initial results framework with outcome-based indicators which were subsequently changed with the new Project Macaya matrix in 2016. The TE was asked to evaluate the new results framework as per which the outputs were only partly achieved. The TE stated that it did not “find evidence showing a positive impact of the project in terms of achieving the decrease of environmental degradation and erosion of carbon stocks in the upper watersheds of Southern Haiti. The environmental degradation has not decreased and the storage of carbon has not increased significantly. As such, the effectiveness of the project in terms of reaching its initial objectives is not achieved” (TE pg 56). The TE gave an Unsatisfactory rating to the effectiveness of the project and the TER also finds that the achievement of targets were only minimally met and thus, gives Unsatisfactory rating.

Component 1: Strengthening local governance:

The component had six outputs aimed to strengthen institutional and local governance. Under this component, the project intended to establish one environmental monitoring team (CSE) which it was able to operationalize through strategic plan, contracting official servants and training the CSE. The project also implemented environmental education program in 38 schools, and conducted 8 priority activities of the Management Plan such as completing inventory of flora and fauna, creating temporary park management council, and submitting a draft version of the Fire Prevention and Control plan in March 2018. For the Macaya infrastructure, the project managed to construct two buildings but they were damaged during Hurricane Matthew and were yet to be repaired at the time of the terminal evaluation. However, for the output on building 12 community infrastructure projects and 24 community workshops, the project built only one state school. Thus, this component was moderately successful in delivering its outputs.

Component 2: Land and forest management:

This component failed to deliver three out of four its outputs on land and forest management. The component aimed to complete environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA) which it completed but was noted to be of poor quality. The TE stated that in the ESIA the impact analysis of planned activities

and associated management plan were absent. The component also expected to restore 20 kms of rural roads but the project did not manage to restore the full length of roads because of delays due to the hurricane. It also failed to develop strategic value chains for private sector due to insufficient budget. However, the project was successful in completing activities on planting 1,150,585 trees and strengthening 118 community groups, and as per the TE, 6,984 people benefited from these activities.

Component 3: Local framework for land ownership:

This component partly delivered four outputs to strengthen local tenure framework. To establish park boundaries, the project demarcated 64 kms of land with 149 markers but this was short of the expected target of 132 kms of demarcation. The project submitted a law for park demarcations to the government which is yet to be approved and it also finalized management plans. However, the management plans need to be updated and made aware of in the public. The project intended to implement 7 research projects in the park and it signed four Memoranda of Understanding with Haitian universities but they were not completed due to delays by Hurricane Matthew.

Component 4: Greenhouse gas emission trading:

The project expected to monitor greenhouse gas and carbon stocks in the Macaya National Park by establishing a monitoring system. The TE stated that a monitoring system was developed “but as the reference plots were damaged by the hurricane, no monitoring has ensued” (TE pg 35). The project trained 9 professionals from partner Haitian institutions and they participated in setting up of plots in Macaya National Park. The component aimed to complete soil studies but no land cover study was documented and also the project lacked regular monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rated efficiency of the project as Moderately Unsatisfactory based on the cost-benefit analysis, which showed that many of the expected outputs were not achieved despite the funding spent. The TE noted that the cost benefit ratio was medium and the expected outputs either generated mixed or unsatisfactory results, for example the poor results of the park infrastructure, management plan and CO2 monitoring system. The TE stated that “most of the unfinished outputs were focused on the sustainable management of the park complemented by the activities in the buffer area. This results in the absence of a tangible project impact on the protection of park resources” (TE pg 57 and 58). The project also experienced several time delays in the beginning and during implementation due to procurement and financial issues. Thus, the TER also gives a rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory towards the efficiency of the project.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unlikely
--------------------	------------------

The TE provided Moderately Unsatisfactory to Unsatisfactory ratings to the four criteria of sustainability of the project. The TER also finds that financial, institutional and environmental sustainability were

unsatisfactory while the socio-economic condition was moderately unsatisfactory. Below is the breakdown of the sustainability criteria:

Financial: The TE rated the financial sustainability as Moderately Unsatisfactory due to uncertainty of financial capacity of certain activities. For hydraulic and agricultural infrastructure, the TE stated “fees paid by the communities for water access are very low and will probably not allow to secure a large enough maintenance fund to repair the impluviums if damage were to occur” (TE pg 59). During Hurricane Matthew the greenhouses were damaged, and the beneficiaries did not have the financial capacity to pay for the repairs, and thus, the project made the payments for the repairs. In terms of the park management team, the TE noted that the current Project Area National Agency did not have financial capacity to keep the project management and it was likely that the trained personnel would stop working after the project closure. Also, the government did not have funds to implement the Macaya National Park management. Thus, the TE gave a Moderately Unsatisfactory and the TER agrees with it.

Socio-political The TE mentioned that the environmental awareness was insufficient, and the absence of providers had negative impact on park activities, for example “the absence of ORE (Environmental Rehabilitation Organization) for ten months (May 2017-March 2018) resulted in the partial deterioration of the nurseries and planted seedling” (TE pg 59). Importantly the communities viewed the “reforestation activities as a constraint as it reduces the availability of arable land rather than as an activity benefiting the park and therefore their quality of life. As such, free-ranging cattle continue to be seen to this day in the park. For similar reasons, the durability of the demarcation activity remains questionable” (TE pg 60). In the case of buffer zones, community management committees took charge of the greenhouse and no such conflict was identified in the zone. The TE gave a Moderately Unsatisfactory and the TER agrees with it.

Institutional: The TE rated the institutional sustainability as Unsatisfactory because of the instability of political system in Haiti, and the TER gives the same rating. “There were quasi-annual changes of Ministers and of governmental institutional structure. Every governmental change is a validation risk or a risk to things created to improve MNNP management, such as the land registry law for the official demarcation of the park or the park management structure” (TE pg 61).

Environmental: The TE rated Unsatisfactory to environmental sustainability and pointed various factors that could impact the sustainability of project activities. It stated that the survival of the seedlings depended on protecting the reforested areas, however, no activities had been planned to protect the areas and “free-ranging seems to be the norm in areas where young pines have been transplanted” (TE pg 62). On gully infrastructure, the TE noted that no concrete action had been taken to prevent erosion and the area was prone to extreme weather events. The TER agrees with the TE rating.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

As per the CEO endorsement document, the project was expected to receive co-financing of \$17,650,000. In the end, the project received co-financing amount of \$21,042,000 which is greater than initial expected co-financing. The TE does not mention whether the co-financing had effect on project's outcomes.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project implementation was due to start in November 2009, but it only began in October 2012. The project had several delays in terms of project implementation, procurement and financial management. The TE mentions that from the side of the Project Management Unit (PMU) there were payment backlogs to service providers and implementation stakeholders which delayed the initial timeline and adversely affected the achievement of expected outcomes. The TE states that "significant consequence of these delays was the loss of local community trust in the project and its partners. Indeed, the partners committed themselves based on the original schedule, but could not respect it due to payment delays. Consequently, the relationship between communities and implementing stakeholders deteriorated" (TE pg 47). Also the procurement process was slow due to several requirements for ministerial approvals.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE reports that there was lack of involvement by stakeholders and so there was no sense of ownership of the project by local communities (TE pg 52). The project also faced lack of clarity in governance and weak participation by local authorities such as in town halls which prevented them from gaining ownership towards the project (TE pg 61).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	------------------------

The TE stated that the initial results framework had absence of baseline data to monitor the indicators, and in the new framework of 2016 the indicators were for activities rather than for outcomes. The TE stated that “this probably contributed to the fact that the activities were carried out independently from one another rather than as a cohesive whole to achieve an objective” (TE pg 49). As per the TE, the output indicators also did not meet the SMART criteria, for instance the indicator of “10% increase of famers’ average net revenue” could not be calculated as it referred to monetary value rather than a proportion. Additionally, the M&E design lacked baseline and sample value. Thus, the TER gives an Unsatisfactory rating to M&E design at entry.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
------------------------	------------------------

The TE rated the M&E system as Unsatisfactory and reported that the monitoring of the project had many flaws. The project indicators had no monitoring system and the PIRs did not have data outlining progress towards the goals. There was also no monitoring of field activities and their impact on project objective to reduce pressure on park’s natural resources. “The lack of a general monitoring system of project outcomes prevented the application of an adaptive management strategy. Such a system would have allowed to quickly determine the lack of impact of certain activities on the overexploitation of resources, and subsequently, led to amendments to the implementation strategy” (TE pg 48). Also, the monitoring of activities did not measure quality of the completed tasks, and awareness. Even the monitoring reports delivered semi-annually did not measure progress of expected outcomes or the general objectives. Therefore, the TER gives an Unsatisfactory rating to M&E implementation.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The IDB was the implementing agency of the project which helped in producing the GEF Tracking Tools at the Mid-Project Review. It also “mobilized an international consultant to follow the program and ensured close monitoring of progress (supervisory trips to the field, training of technical and administrative teams). Despite this supervision, the project was not able to maintain a clear implementation strategy” (TE pg 46). Due to the constant turnover of project staff, the IDB had to focus on proper administrative and financial

management instead of providing technical supervision to the project activities. However, since 2015 “field visits by the IDB team were more regular and communication between the IDB and the PMU easier. Additionally, the IDB, despite the changing teams and unexpected events (such as the hurricane), showed flexibility in terms of adapting the park activities to the realities of the field” (TE pg 46). Considering the effort put by IDB to provide supervisory role, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the quality of project implementation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The executing agency of the project was the Ministry of Environment and the TE gave a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to project execution. The TE noted that the Environment Minister did not process the contracts and payments on time which delayed the payments and the PMU team had to travel to Port-au-Prince to get documents signed. The communication of the ministry with other teams including supervision work was relatively poor during project duration. The supervisory agency, the National Agency for Protected Areas (ANAP), limited its role to technical supervision and limited itself to monitoring trips. Due to the limited role played by the executing agency, the TER gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to the quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE mentioned that the benefits resulting from the pine plantations were not visible because they were still saplings at the time of evaluation. The 200,000 fruit trees planted could help to avoid soil erosion and contribute to carbon storage.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE pointed that the communities found the construction of weirs helpful as it created 156 temporary jobs and the “beneficiaries mentioned that HILF (High Intensity Labor Force) activities allowed them to

pay their children's school fees as well as hire extra farm workers" (TE pg 58). Additionally, activities pertaining to agriculture also "contributed to an increase in food security and in revenue in associated households. The activities cited as most useful by the surveyed farmers were: i) production of yams in minisets resistant to disease; ii) the association of crops in eco-friendly gardens, allowing the diversification of crops and year-long production; and iii) the introduction of perennial crops (e.g. banana, sugar cane, and yams) as alternatives to seasonal crops" (TE pg 58).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities: the TE mentioned that the project trained personnel in environmental monitoring, fire management, and trained beneficiaries in agriculture.

b) Governance: The TE does not mention changes in governance by the project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are mentioned in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE does not mention adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The following are key lessons provided by the TE (TE pgs 65-66):

- a) To achieve positive results, it is necessary to maintain stable coordination team throughout the project with coherent implementation strategy;

- b) Stakeholder contracts need to be precise and should include i) strict clauses regarding breaches of contract if performance is not completed and ii) payment unblocking conditions dependent on the quality of deliverables and achieving properly defined, tangible results;
- c) Stakeholders and project team should maintain credibility for the local communities from the time of first consultations to the end of implementation;
- d) There should be autonomy in administrative and financial management, and the Director should have clear and well-framed roles and responsibilities, with a signing and decision-making proxy, in order to limit important administrative delays to project implementation;
- e) Detailed knowledge of the park should be necessary in order to work and plan activities;
- f) It should be necessary to precisely identify the communities or groups which are responsible for the degradation in order to tailor specific and adapted responses to each case; and
- g) Negotiations should be continuous with the communities living in and around the park.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations given by the TE are (TE pg 67):

- a) Invest and work in the park by increasing knowledge of park realities, and taking concrete actions in the Macaya National Park;
- b) Improving project functioning and governance;
- c) Capitalizing on investments in regard to infrastructure and park access in Formond;
- d) Considering the feasibility of Phase II of the project and it is imperative that the next project differ from the current one and capitalizes on the lessons learned.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE describes elaborately describes the relevant outcomes and impacts and gives a good overview of outcomes that were expected in the original project design and after the changes in 2016.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The ratings and description of evidence evaluation criteria are consistent and convincing.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE properly provides an explanation of the sustainability criteria and gives appropriate rating. It also provides an exit strategy by giving recommendations on how to initiate the Phase II of the project.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations are elaborately presented in the report	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE provides project costs per component as well as co-financing information	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE provides information on M&E implementation but only provides a brief comment on M&E design at entry	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

The TER did not use any other sources than TE and PAD.