

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2017

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3733	
GEF Agency project ID		3971	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti	
Country/Countries		Haiti	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		To support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment, Haiti	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Project stakeholders, partners in execution	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		18/04/2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		09/2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		06/2014	
Actual date of project completion		31/10/2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.5	3.5
Co-financing	IA own	0.2	0.2
	Government	9.58	8.08
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		2.7
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.5	3.5
Total Co-financing		9.78	11.98
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		13.28	15.48
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		January 2017	
Author of TE		Alexandre Borde	
TER completion date		5/30/2018	
TER prepared by		Selin Erdogan	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project is to strengthen adaptive capacity of populations and productive sectors in coastal areas to address increasing climate change risks. (PIF, pg.1)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is to “strengthen Haiti’s capacity to mainstream climate change adaptation policies into local and national development plans” (TE, pg.15) To achieve its development objective, the project outlined four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Institutional capacity to plan for and respond to climate induced impacts in coastal areas improved

Outcome 2: Climate Risks Management is fully mainstreamed into humanitarian and development investment frameworks

Outcome 3: Resilience of low-elevation coastal zones to emerging climate change threats enhanced.

Outcome 4: Models of best practices and lessons learned from the project activities captured and institutionalized

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

There were no changes to the Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives throughout the project implementation.

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 consistent with Haiti's First National Communication-INC (2001) and National Action Programs for Adaptation (NAPA) which identify climate change threats on Low Elevation Coastal Zones (LECZ) as a primary area of focus for immediate adaptation actions. The project has also contributed to the implementation of the recommendations and strategies embedded in Haiti's Poverty Reduction Strategy (2008-2010) and was aligned with the three Strategic Pillars of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and consistent with the cross-cutting measures embedded in the document about reducing the vulnerability of the poorest to climate change induced disasters. (PIF, pg.5)

The project contributes to achieving UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Outcomes and UNDP Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) Outputs: (i) Strategic, legal, institutional and communicational frameworks are developed; and their implementation promoted to better address environmental and natural resources management problems at the national and local levels; (ii) Tools and systems to improve access to drinking water, sanitation services, and management of solid wastes are developed and implemented. The project was also in line with GEF-4 Climate Change Strategic Objective to "support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change". (TE, pg.40)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------

The TE provides a combined rating for efficiency and effectiveness as Satisfactory and provides an evaluation of achievements by component. This TER rates project effectiveness as Satisfactory. The project has achieved its objective by increasing the resilience of low-elevation coastal zones to emerging climate change threats and increasing the institutional capacity to respond to climate induced impacts in coastal areas. The project has delivered most of the planned outcomes despite minor shortcomings.

Achievements under the projects originally planned outcomes are listed below:

Outcome 1 Institutional capacity to plan for and respond to climate induced impacts in coastal areas improved: This Outcome has been mostly achieved with one target fully achieved and two others partially achieved. By the end of the project, all targeted partners had allocated budget lines to implement adaptation measures and awareness. Workshops have been undertaken but Early Warning system (EWS) was not adapted in all 30 communes as targeted. The project has supported the production of information on climate change and vulnerability in Haiti through Climatic Analyses studies (2014), and the report on Coastal surveillance and early warning systems for climate change adaptation

(2012). TE notes that some cooperation issues slowed down CNIGS' (National Center of Geospatial Information) activities delaying the realization of the vulnerability study. (TE, pg.52)

Outcome 2 Climate Risks Management is fully mainstreamed into humanitarian and development investment frameworks: This outcome has been mostly achieved. A report evaluating climate change adaptation costs has been developed with the Finance Ministry, accordingly the capacity of the Ministry of Environment to integrate climate change costs in its policies has been strengthened through technical support and knowledge sharing on climate change cost estimation and climate proof public investment. Cooperation between the government and key donors has been successful in developing food security resilient programs in and around coastal areas, however TE notes that an official national strategic framework was not developed as one of the targets of this outcome, however a process to elaborate a national policy of climate change has been launched. (TE, pg.53)

Outcome 3: Resilience of low-elevation coastal zones to emerging climate change threats enhanced. The targets of this outcome have been fully achieved. A wide number of outreach and sensitization activities have been undertaken in all the communes. The project has supported six pilot adaptation initiatives in the South and Southeast implemented by the Ministry of Environment with most of them having successful outcomes. These were: (i) watershed management for CCA in Jacmel communes, (ii) Drinking water supply system rehabilitation and construction in Jacmel and Cayes-Jacmel, (iii) reforestation in Aquin/Saint-louis hydrographic unit, (iv) Integrated watershed Management by watershed committees, (v) Ecosystem-based Adaptation through mangrove conservation, (vi) Farm Plans project for food security and climate change adaptation in South departments. TE notes that these projects have resulted in increased food security in targeted communities and reduced water-related diseases spread. (TE, pg.55)

Outcome 4: Models of best practices and lessons learned from the project activities captured and institutionalized. This outcome was successfully achieved; a full report on lessons learnt and best practices which has been disseminated both online and in hard copy to key stakeholders and donors. The project was brought into attention during COP 22 in Morocco in December 2016 and was presented during meetings on climate information analysis.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

As mentioned before, the TE provided a combined rating for efficiency and effectiveness as Satisfactory. This TER rates the efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory due to several project delays.

TE notes that project expenses were well managed and Global Affairs Canada (GAC) fast-start finance was highly efficient (TE, pg.67) The analysis of the expenditures as of October 31, 2016 confirms an overall disbursement rate for GEF, UNDP and GAC as 90% ,91.6% and 91.6% respectively.

The project had a slow start that was attributed to a complicated political transition in the country and has experienced serious delays in the first year. The delay in the selection of the new Minister of

Environment and appointment of the Project coordinator also affected the project negatively. The departure of the environmental focal point of UNDP in mid-2012 resulted in difficulties to efficiently monitor progress of the project coordination unit.

The project was expected to last four years until December 2015 and was granted a nine months extension following a request from UNDP Country Office. (TE, pg.26)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE rates project sustainability as Likely, however this TER revises the rating to Moderately Likely. TE find the sustainability of undertaken activities likely, noting that a replication of the activities would still be required for sustainable benefits including extension of the practices of the project to other vulnerable zones of the country.

Financial Resources Sustainability: Moderately Likely Key donors have prioritized climate change adaptation actions in their future programs and have decided to allocate internal resources and open up new budget lines to support climate change work that would likely guarantee the sustainability of project achievements after closure. However, TE notes that more financial resources might be needed to continue the implementation of all trainings on the various tools aiming at mainstreaming the climate change impacts. (TE, pg.61)

Sociopolitical Sustainability: Moderately Likely The project has increased awareness and knowledge of all stakeholders on climate change adaptation. The local communities which engaged in development of alternative agricultural practices and reforestation and benefited from the project will likely support the efforts of adaptation led by local governments, however political instability and context might still be a risk in the coming years. (TE, pg.62)

Institutional Framework and Governance Sustainability: Moderately Likely Although the development of a National Climate Change Policy would be instrumental for future initiatives, unless the project activities are replicated on a large scale, the outcomes would be limited to local communities and not generalized nationwide.

Environmental Sustainability: Moderately Likely The project is designed to achieve environmental sustainability through reforestation activities and mangrove conservation project, however TE notes that the possibility of a natural climatic disaster is still a risk to some project outcomes. (TE, pg.61)

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?

Government of Haiti provided co-financing of 8,080,000 USD in-kind against 9,580,000 USD declared at CEO endorsement. The TE does not exactly clarify the reason behind the gap. Global Affairs Canada

(GAC) provided co-financing of 2,700,000 in 2013 which has considerably improved project performance at the time.

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 operation of the project was delayed at the beginning by organizational and institutional difficulties including the departure of the National Focal Point and the recruitment of a new project coordinator. This has been mitigated by the UNDP and the PMU. Additional co-financing from Global Affairs Canada (GAC) starting in 2013 benefited the project which ultimately received an extension for the closing date to finalize project activities. (TE, pg.67)

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:

Local authorities and other national institutions partners participated actively in project implementation; departmental representations of the ministries of environment and agriculture provided their support through their experts, and local communities through the various groups. (TE, pg.60)

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE rates M&E as satisfactory, however does not provide a separate rating for design but rates the implementation phase as satisfactory. This TER rates M&E design at entry as Satisfactory. Planning for monitoring and evaluation was quite comprehensive and detailed in the project document, including the M&E activities at the project start initiated by the Inception Workshop, quarterly and annual monitoring mechanisms, periodic site visits by relevant UNDP units and independent evaluations at mid-project and project completion. TE notes that a consistent budget was implemented to ensure the functioning of M&E. (TE, pg.61)

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as Satisfactory and this TER concurs. The mid-term review found that the monitoring and evaluation system was fragile and unreliable at the time and provided

recommendations that have been implemented and had positive consequences on the project execution, with appropriate adjustments of project coordination and management. (MTE, pg.9) The mid-term review also pointed out the need for more competent human resources which resulted in reinforcement of the management and coordination teams.

The M&E tool was updated with credible data obtained from technical reports of partners and collected during M&E field visits. Before each disbursement, an M&E visit was conducted and a field visit report was produced to be shared with partners including the lesson learned and the recommendations. (TE, pg.46)

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: Satisfactory
<p>The implementing agency of the project is UNDP. The TE rates the quality of project implementation as Satisfactory and this TER concurs. The TE notes that the UNDP's implementation, monitoring and facilitation work was provided adequately throughout the project, however does not provide detailed information on the supervision performance of the agency. The implementation of the project was carried out under the general guidance of a Project Steering Committee (PSC), specifically formed for this purpose. The PSC included the National Committee for Territorial or Land Use Public Infrastructure and Projects (CIAT); composed of 7 Ministries such as the Ministries of Interior and Territorial Communities, Economy and Finance, Planning and Cooperation, Agriculture and Rural Development, Culture and Communication, Public Works, Transportation and Communication, and Environment. Agencies co-financing and representatives of the civil society and local authorities were also involved.</p>	
7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory

The executing agency of the project is Ministry of Environment. The TE rates the quality of project execution as Satisfactory and this TER concurs. The TE notes that the ministry effectively supported the project with the provision of premises and staff throughout the life of the project, and provided an appropriate political and technical supervision of the project. The project was faced with institutional and organizational difficulties resulting from the departure of the environmental focal point of UNDP in mid-2012 and other difficulties to efficiently monitor progress of the project coordination unit. The project was pending from June to end of September 2013, however following the renewal of the Project

Management Unit after September 2013 has significantly increased the implementation dynamics of the project activities.

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 project itself targets enhanced environmental protection, however the results are not quantifiable as of project completion.

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.

Through this project, farmers learned to adopt measures that can enable them to adapt to climate change such as teaching of appropriate agricultural techniques, agroforestry, selection and cultivation of species resistant to drought. It's noted that some beneficiaries also received technical and financial support to develop income generating activities such as seeds treatment and modern beekeeping. (TE, pg.48)

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

50 training workshops on Climate Change Adaptation (CCA), food security, climate information, and disaster risk management have been undertaken by more than 1,200 people. Awareness raising

campaigns reaching more than 200,000 people, 2150 communication materials and manuals relating to CCA and 8 CCA pilot projects have been developed/ implemented as a result of this project. (TE, pg.19)

b) Governance

The TE notes that “issues of governance for resilience to climate change that require a higher-level approach and that were beyond the reach of the project remains a trend of dispersion and weakening of governance and normative responsibilities through (i) the multiplication of ad hoc structures in the public administration and (ii) parliamentarians being honored mostly for their interventions as infrastructure project promoters rather than as regulators and monitors of the action of the executive power.” (TE, pg.62)

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 of the project are reported affecting ecological or social aspects.

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 project design assumed that lessons learned and experiences would be disseminated and replicated through initiatives presented under Outcome 4 of the project and the TE indicates the availability of strong documentation of project activities to inform broader applications. Replication is planned to cover other coastal areas in the project intervention area and for this purpose, guidelines for replication and up-scaling of good practices from the pilot project in the South East have been developed and the ecotourism project in the Southern region was being considered for replication. (TE, pg.36)

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 main points derived from the project were reported as follows (TE, pg.67):

- The ACC project supported the development of eight pilot projects on climate change adaptation, introducing local communities to know-how and new technologies, which allowed them to better adapt to climate change.
- The operation of the project was delayed, at the beginning, by organizational and institutional difficulties including the departure of the National Focal Point and the recruitment of a new RNP. This starting dysfunction has been well treated by the UNDP and the PMU. Moreover, the co-financing from GAC starting in 2013 boosted the project. The project thus received an extension for the project closing date, which allowed the finalization of many activities.
- The project has arguably strengthened the Direction for Climate Change as well as the department offices for environment (DDE/SE and DDE/S). Institutional capacity has thus been enhanced, especially since the project triggered an inter-ministry cooperation on the multi-sectoral aspects of climate change.
- Project expenses were well managed, particularly with respect to the preparation of PTAs. Moreover, GAC fast-start finance was highly efficient; the allocation to the ACC project was relevant and fulfilling Canada's commitments.
- The recommendations of the mid-term review were followed by actions, which helped to integrate the necessary changes and adjustments, specific to any implementation project.
- The extensive inclusion of gender aspects in project activities and monitoring has been a success with a strong participation of women in the pilot projects.
- The ACC project has generated a wide amount of knowledge and information on climate change in Haiti, disseminating knowledge not only on the impacts of climate change but on adaptation approaches and practices. Awareness-raising has reached more than 200,000 people and the project has triggered a strong implication of local communities as well as institutional stakeholders across ministries. The partnership with DINEPA/OREPA on watershed pilot projects has been particularly successful.
- No clear exit strategy has been developed by national parties as to how adaptation measures will be sustained after the project financing. Yet, the implementation of the EU AP3C project and a new GAC project are guaranteeing further implementation of some adaptation activities. There is a need to build a strong exit strategy to ensure the sustainability of acquired adaptive capacity at national and local level.
- The country's need for technical and financial assistance is still strong as climate change adverse impacts become more and more severe. Adaptation strategies and technologies must be scaled up and developed across the country.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE summarizes the following recommendations for this project (TE, pg.21-22):

First, the positive results of the project must be recovered and replicated at a larger scale as implicitly requested by the Government through the INDC. Partnerships with NGOs and other technical partners must be strengthened in future projects. More generally, coordination with donors and other development and climate actors in Haiti must be pursued, amplified and extended to new actors such as the Green Climate Fund. It is recommended to formulate a concept note for an amount of around USD 40 million, to implement a nationwide resilience and reforestation project. This project could be implemented in vulnerable zones in the South and Grande Anse departments. UNDP, as the most active Accredited Entity to the GCF, would be a good partner to assist the government in its implementation.

- The country must develop a clear strategy for climate financing in the country at national and international level. The application of the MEF to become a GCF accredited entity must be supported using GCF's readiness funds. UNDP's experience in GCF procedures could be highly beneficial. Another partner through the GCCA for this exercise could be the EU.
- The cooperation between the UNDP and national and local authorities should be pursued on similar themes to those covered by the ACC project, including on access to water resources, reforestation, and marine and coastal ecosystems.
- The greater institutional capacity triggered by the project must be sustained and enhanced. The DCC website must remain active, the DCC should continue hiring experts, and adaptation activities should follow up in departments but also with communes. Climate change should be mainstreamed in the country's sectoral policies, starting by integrating climate change adaptation in the national budget planning. The inter-ministry cooperation created by the project must be continued and environmental aspects must be integrated into multi-sectoral policies.
- Similarly, GAC should continue financing adaptation activities building on the achievements of the project in the field of sustainable agriculture and with watershed committees.
- Cooperation between national agencies and municipalities ("communes") should be developed to ensure more sustainability of adaptation measures at local level and for better harmonization of adaptation initiatives.
- The project has created a dynamic favorable to climate change adaptation action at national and local level, but as it was the first adaptation initiative many activities must be continued and extended. As part of the next programmatic cycle, it is recommended to focus transversely on water access, strengthening resilience of subsistence livelihoods in isolated areas with highly vulnerable communities, and adaptation to climate change for health.

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 report provides a detailed assessment of project outcomes; each indicator and project targets are evaluated based on achievement levels.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report content is consistent and ratings are well substantiated for the project outcomes. The section of project efficiency, M&E design and implementing agency performance could have used more detail to substantiate the relevant the ratings	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability is properly assessed at four dimensions	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The report provides recommendations based on lessons learned, does not separately provide a section on lessons learned.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs and co-financing but do not provide any details on the costs at activity level	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report rates the M&E design and implementation as satisfactory, although more detail on the performance at entry would be useful, the section on adaptive management provides beneficial information	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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