



**Haiti Reconstruction Fund**  
A Fund for Recovery, Reconstruction and Development of Haiti



## STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING 4/2010<sup>1</sup>

### Minutes

1. The fourth meeting of the Steering Committee (SC) of the Haiti Reconstruction Fund (HRF) was held on December 15, 2010 at the MINUSTAH Log Base, Port au Prince with video connection to the World Bank Office in Santo Domingo (see Annex 1 for a list of members and observers). The main objective of the meeting was to consider the financing requests put forth for HRF funding by the Interim Haiti Recovery Commission (IHRC). Other matters for discussion on the agenda were the new IHRC Strategy for the HRF, donor preferencing, and the HRF Six-Month Progress Report. In addition, the Trustee, the HRF Secretariat and each of the Partner Entities provided brief updates on activities since the last SC Meeting. The order of the meeting is detailed in the Agenda in Annex 2 of these minutes.

### **Welcome by Chairperson**

2. The Chairperson, Mr. Ronald Baudin, Minister of Finance, welcomed all participants to the Fourth HRF SC Meeting. He expressed his regret that due to the current political situation the Steering Committee members could not all meet together in Port-au-Prince and hoped that this would be the last time that a meeting would have to be held outside of Haiti. The Chairperson thanked the World Bank and the UN for making their facilities available for the meeting. He also expressed special thanks to all donors that have already transferred their contributions to the Fund and welcomed new and existing donors to make further contributions to the HRF. In particular he expressed thanks to Canada, Norway and the United States who have indicated that they will provide supplemental contributions to the Fund.

3. The proposed agenda for the meeting was adopted as presented (see Annex 2).

### **Approval of Minutes of October 7, 2010 Meeting**

4. The Minutes of the Third HRF Steering Committee Meeting that was held on October 7, 2010 were put forth for SC approval. The Chairperson indicated that the minutes incorrectly indicated a large financing gap for public employee salaries and a request from the Minister to the U.S. for budget

---

<sup>1</sup> As approved by the HRF Steering Committee on March 1, 2011

support funds to fill this gap. To this extent the Minister requested that the first two sentences on page 3 of the October 7 SC Meeting minutes be revised to read: “The Finance Minister noted that the Government was able to pay the salaries of public employees and asked if the U.S. budget support could be used for other purposes.” It was agreed to make the requested change in the minutes.

5. Brazil noted that the adoption of the Financial Allocation Guiding Principles was not reflected in the minutes and that the document should be attached to the minutes as an Annex. The HRF Secretariat representative explained that the Financial Allocation Guiding Principles had not been adopted. He explained that due to difficulty in communications at that specific time, the HRF Secretariat had erroneously understood that there was a consensus within the government on the adoption of the Financial Allocation Guiding Principles. The HRF Secretariat representative further explained that the issues raised by Brazil at the last meeting had two very important impacts – one was the development of the strategy that was presented at the IHRC meeting of December 14, which also highlighted the need for funds for the future, and the other was the strong push by the IHRC and the government to discourage donor preferencing.

6. The Chairperson explained that he understood the Brazilian position but, with many donors preferencing their contributions, the IHRC and HRF were merely functioning as pass-through windows. If funds were non-preferenced, they could be used by the IHRC for the most urgent priority activities. The chairperson confirmed that following a meeting with Gabriel Verret, Josef Leitmann and Alexandre Abrantes, it was decided that a letter signed by the Chairperson of the Fund and the Co-chairs of the IHRC addressing the preferencing issue would be sent to donors and that the Prime Minister intended to talk to donors, and specifically reach out to the Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the hope that this would reverse the tendency toward preferencing. In addition, the Chairperson would discuss the issue with the Ambassador of Brazil to Haiti.

7. The Brazilian representative highlighted that the last correspondence that he had received from the HRF Secretariat on the Financial Allocation Guiding Principles was on October 22<sup>nd</sup>, confirming that, following the end of the no-objection period and after having contacted the chairperson, the HRF SC had approved the setting aside of US\$30 million for the three projects in the South department and the adoption of the Financial Allocation Guiding Principles. The Representative informed the SC that he would thus not be in a position to adopt the minutes or approve anything as the Brazilian government needs to be duly informed of any changes.

8. The HRF Secretariat Representative noted that not approving the minutes would impact the approval of the three projects that had been submitted for funding at the October 7 SC Meeting as well as the overall performance of the Fund during its first six months. It was suggested not to approve the minutes at this time but to approve them at a later date in the next few weeks once comments from the Government of Brazil could be incorporated. The Norwegian representative requested that the approval of the minutes not wait until the next meeting but that this would be done virtually in the interim.

9. The Canadian Representative asked whether an attempt had been made to contact the SC when the financing strategy was retracted. The HRF Secretariat explained that the intention had been for the

letter from the IHRC Co-chairs and the HRF SC chairperson to communicate this to the SC. Unfortunately, the letter did not go out and the Secretariat could not communicate the change in advance of the minister. The letter would go out in the coming days. There is a clear HRF financing strategy from the GoH and there needs to be a bilateral discussion between the GoH and the GoB .

10. The Brazilian Representative highlighted the importance of transparency and that as a member of the SC one cannot come to a meeting without being fully informed given the high-level interest in Brazil and that decisions cannot be made alone. Brazil believes that the Fund is worth supporting and wanted to serve as an example by making an unpreferenced contribution. Brazil could have done as many countries did but did not. Steering Committee members cannot work together if they are not informed and at the Brazilian government at the highest level needs to be informed that the SC was misinformed.

11. The Canadian representative proposed to amend the minutes by retaining the first two sentences of the last paragraph of page 5 of the minutes and revising the subsequent two sentences to state that the Committee was not able to come to an agreement on the projects and the financing strategy note. By making this revision, the minutes could be approved immediately. Brazil agreed with this proposed change, but Norway expressed grave concern that this would mean a setback of several months by not approving the projects.

12. The HRF Secretariat representative added that the projects could be recirculated on a five-day no objection basis, which would mean a delay of weeks not months. However, the Norwegian representative objected that even a delay of weeks was unacceptable. In addition, it was noted that if the three projects were not approved this would significantly impact the performance of the Fund in eyes of the public and potential donors.

13. The HRF Secretariat representative noted that there should be a bilateral discussion between the GoH and the GoB. The question was raised when such a discussion would take place. The Minister responded that he could contact the Brazilian ambassador at any time, but that he was unsure as to when the Prime Minister would be available to contact the Brazilian minister of Foreign Affairs. The Brazilian representative agreed that it was a very good idea for the GoH and the GoB to discuss this at the highest levels. The HRF Secretariat representative suggested that one option would be to leave the minutes to the side and to let bilateral discussions go on in the hope that the minutes could be approved in the coming days. The U.S. representative expressed his understanding of both frustrations, but stressed the need to move forward.

14. The HRF Secretariat representative mentioned that Brazil had sent a preferencing letter and suggested that in the minutes the GOH could recognize the receipt of the preferencing letter and recognize the Brazilian request to set aside \$40 million whilst awaiting the resolution of the preferencing question. The Brazilian representative suggested that the preferencing question should be debated first as the IHRC Executive Director had given the impression in the previous day's IHRC meeting that no

preferencing would be allowed and that there would likely then be more support among SC members for Brazil's position.

15. The Canadian representative, noting that Canada was the only voting member not to have preferred its contribution, said that a consensus on the preferencing issue would not likely be reached at the meeting and that this debate should not hold up the three projects. The HRF Secretariat suggested that the meeting move on to the discussion of preferencing and that in the mean time the secretariat would prepare proposed text for the minutes of the Third Steering Committee.

16. The Secretariat then proposed the following language to be included in the minutes: "In response to the letter sent by the Government of Brazil to the Steering Committee (see Annex 4), US\$ 40 million will be set aside for an eventual proposal for the Artibonite 4C dam. The Steering Committee will take into consideration the outcome of discussions between the Government of Haiti and the international community on preferencing." The language regarding the approval of the three projects would be retained. Brazil agreed with the proposed language. The Chairperson confirmed that all SC members were in agreement. **DECISION:** The October 7 SC minutes would be revised by replacing the following two sentences "A Financing Strategy note would be prepared by the Fund Secretariat. The Chairperson subsequently authorized an additional five working-day review period for the projects (through Thursday, October 21) and removed the Financing Strategy note (now called the Financial Allocation Guiding Principles) from consideration." with the following text: "In response to the letter sent by the Government of Brazil to the Steering Committee (see Annex 4), US\$ 40 million will be set aside for an eventual proposal for the Artibonite 4C dam. The Steering Committee will take into consideration the outcome of discussions between the Government of Haiti and the international community on preferencing." The remainder of the paragraph would not be revised.

17. With this change the Minutes of the October 7 SC Meeting were adopted.

#### **Remarks by IHRC Representative**

18. The Chairperson requested the IHRC representative to provide an overview of the IHRC Strategy that had been presented at the December 14 IHRC Board meeting. The IHRC Executive Director was not able to be present at the meeting due to unexpected travel by Co-chair Clinton to Haiti and was not able to send a delegate to represent him (Mr. Pierre Nadji was present as an IHRC observer but did not speak). The HRF Secretariat representative offered to provide a brief summary of the IHRC's strategy for the HRF. He explained that at the IHRC Commission meeting it had been highlighted by the Executive Director that a significant sum was being channeled through the HRF, but that preferencing had left no flexibility in the use of the funds. The strategy therefore proposed that, of the US\$1.5 billion of the remaining unallocated pledged donor funds, 50 percent should be channeled through the Fund and used to fill financing gaps in the eight priority sectors identified by the IHRC. The HRF Secretariat representative noted that the Secretariat had not been consulted on the proposed strategy. The

representative of France added that President Clinton had given no opportunity to discuss or endorse the strategy at the IHRC Commission meeting.

19. The Chairperson sought feedback from SC members on the Strategy. The Canadian representative again highlighted the frustration expressed by the IHRC representative vis-à-vis the preferencing of funds. In this regard, he proposed to frame the discussion on preferencing by keeping in mind three types of preferencing: (i) budget support – the Fund is an instrument for line item budget support and it is in the interest of the GoH to have a clear strategy on this; (ii) preferences that respond directly to strategies that come out of the IHRC; and (iii) other preferences and projects that are not in the IHRC priority list. He noted that asking the donors to contribute 50 percent of unallocated resources to the Fund would cause a delay in moving forward with the projects that are already under preparation as, for most donors, this would require going back to their cabinets or parliaments to increase the contributions to the HRF, which is a lengthy and hard to predict process. He added that the sector strategies presented by the IHRC would assist donors in channeling bilateral funding for priority interventions.

20. The World Bank representative reiterated that there was no earmarking of funds when donors sign Administration Agreements and that the letters of preferencing do not constitute an official commitment or guarantee. The SC is free to use funds for a different purpose. Most of the funds should be untied but it is understood that, in certain cases, parliaments are involved and impose limitations. The French representative added that almost all preferenced activities would fit within the eight priority areas identified by the IHRC. Donors could identify sectors as opposed to specific projects or line item budget support. The Chairperson shared the French representative's view that budget support and investment financing should not be targeted. The U.S. representative said that the U.S. Congress expects certain contributions to go to specific sectors and that they had to work within that constraint, while noting the importance of donors aligning their funds with IHRC priorities.

### **Brief Updates**

21. Moving on to the next agenda item the Chair invited the representative of the Trustee to present the Trustee's update on the financial status of the Fund.

22. **Trustee** – The Trustee presented an update on the financial status of the Fund as of November 30, 2010. Referring to the tables in the Trustee Report that was circulated to the SC priority to the meeting, the Trustee representative informed the SC that Administration Agreements/Arrangements had now been signed with eleven donors and that all contributions had been received. In addition to these effective contributions the trustee is also in active communication with donors that are interested in contributing, namely Latvia for LVL 33,000 (US\$ eq. 65,000), Ireland for €1 million, Finland for €700,000, and Japan for US\$30 million. A US\$2 million contribution from the World Bank-managed State and Peace Building Fund was also expected to be received in the coming days. The Trustee is also following up with other donors including the EC for a contribution of US\$30 million equivalent. In early

October, the EC received the Administration Agreement in the form approved by the HRF donors. Since that time, the World Bank and EC legal teams have been in discussion. Table 2 of the Trustee Report presents the cumulative funding decisions. The total funds allocated so far amounted to US\$91 million. Table 3 of the Trustee Report presents how much funding is available. With contributions received of US\$265 million and allocations of US\$91 million, US\$174 million was available for future funding decisions. As of November 30, US\$26 million was transferred to Partner Entities, of which US\$25 million for projects and US\$1.59 as Administrative Budget for the Secretariat and the Trustee. Since November 30, Transfer Agreements were concluded with all Partner Entities and a further US\$29.45 was transferred to Partner Entities; US\$16.95 million to the UN and US\$12.5 million to the IDB, bringing the cumulative transfers as of December 15 to US\$56 million. US\$35 million remains to be transferred. This will be transferred to the Partner Entities upon their request to the Trustee and approval of the projects by the Steering Committee. These new figures will be reflected in the six-month progress report.

23. The Chairperson thanked the Trustee for its report. The French representative requested that a column with US\$ amounts be added in Table 1 of the Trustee report. The Spanish representative noted that Spain had approved a contribution of US\$30 million to HRF and would disburse an initial contribution of US\$13 million.

24. **Secretariat** – The Secretariat representative started by reporting on additional expected contributions from Canada, France, Japan, Nigeria, Thailand, and the United States. Japan’s parliament has approved a US\$30 million contribution to the HRF and an arrangement with the Trustee was being finalized. Qatar (US\$20 million) and Saudi Arabia were also potential contributors. The Secretariat has been engaged in several communication activities in the run up to the one-year anniversary of the earthquake. A workshop with Haitian radio and print press was held in Port-au-Prince on November 15 to improve their understanding of the HRF. Although not a statutory requirement, the Secretariat is preparing a six-month progress report to take stock and show the role the HRF has played in the reconstruction as an input for the one-year anniversary of the earthquake. A competition among school children to design the logo, slogan and jingle for the Fund is ongoing. The competition is managed by a Haitian NGO (AfricAmerica). Entries from schools were received this week and a jury would be convened to make the final selection next week. Lastly, a photo competition was held among photo-journalists and in communities with disposable cameras. 100 disposable cameras were distributed in villages and communities. All pictures were being developed this week and the jury would convene next week to select the winning entries. The photos from the competition would be used to embellish the six-month report. The prize ceremony for both the school and photo competition would be held on January 9.

25. The question was raised as to whether the Secretariat had stayed within the US\$50,000 budget allocated for communication activities. The Secretariat representative confirmed that the US\$50,000 covered these and other communication activities through June 30, 2011.

26. **Partner Entities** – Each of the Partner Entities was invited to provide an update on progress. **IDB** – The IDB representative informed the SC that the Partial Credit Guarantee Project would be launched on December 16 at an official launch ceremony with the Governor of the Central Bank and

representatives of financial institutions. The Partial Credit Guarantee Fund would then become effective as of January 15, 2011. **UN** – The funds for the UNDP Debris Management Project were recently received by the UN. Many preparatory activities had already been undertaken, including an agreement with the Ministry of Public Works to determine the intervention zones and methodology for works. Target areas and a project leader for each area have been identified. A technical mission was undertaken to determine what could be done with the recycled rubble. Crushers had been selected and contracts for the heavy equipment were being finalized. UNDP is already active in the project area and has already invested US\$500,000 in collaboration with UN Habitat and the ILO. **WB** - The World Bank representative informed the SC that the World Bank Board had approved a small contribution to the Partial Credit Guarantee Fund Program. In addition, the World Bank had fully disbursed the US\$25 million for budget support. The World Bank representative suggested that a meeting be held with the Prime Minister to discuss supplemental budget support.

27. The French representative requested an update on the fiscal situation in Haiti. In response, the representative from the International Monetary Fund provided a brief update on the fiscal situation in Haiti.

- FY2010 Budget:
  - ✓ Revenue amounted to about HTG31.5 billion, compared with about HTG35 billion in the budget published before the earthquake.
  - ✓ Revenue recovered faster than expected after the earthquake because of the authorities efforts to quickly restart revenue administration; strong performances of income taxes, which depended on pre-earthquake activity; as well as strong collection from taxes on goods and services, reflecting strong activity following increased international assistance and reconstruction efforts.
  - ✓ Wages and salaries were in line with expectations despite the wage bonus given to public employees in August (about HTG1 billion).
  - ✓ Spending on goods and services were also in line with expectations.
  - ✓ Transfers and subsidies continue to be high, especially for the electricity sector (about HTG2.7 billion). One should note that in addition to these transfers, the electricity sector also receives government support through the public investment program and through off-budget transfers from Petrocaribe resources (about US\$ 4 to 5 million per month).
  - ✓ Investment spending significantly accelerated toward the end of the year, reaching about HTG11.3 billion. In addition, the government spent about HTG3 billion from Petrocaribe resources.
  - ✓ The deficit excluding grants and externally financed projects is estimated at HTG14.2 billion (or 5.4 percent of GDP).
  - ✓ In addition to domestic revenue, government spending was financed through increased international solidarity (about US\$225 million in grants). The Government also successfully issued about HTG300 million in treasury bills (with 28-day maturity).

- ✓ The Government has significantly stepped up its transparency efforts. In particular, the website of the Ministry of the Economy and Finance provides important information on the performances of revenue administration and the execution of government spending, including the public investment program and Petrocaribe projects.
- FY2011 Budget:
    - ✓ The budget is ready but not yet published. It has been sent to the audit court (CSCCA).
    - ✓ Revenue is projected to reach HTG36 billion.
    - ✓ The introduction of new exemption measures is not a step in the right direction. In particular exemption measures dealing with imports of equipment, rental income, and donations to charity can easily lead to fraud and further erode the tax base. Moreover, these exemptions will further complicate the tax system.
    - ✓ The wage bill will remain stable as a share of GDP, (about HTG17 billion). There will be a wage adjustment for employees earning less than the minimum as their wages will be brought to the legal minimum.
    - ✓ Spending on goods and services will increase in line with nominal GDP (about HTG8.5 billion).
    - ✓ Transfers will continue to be high (about HTG7.5 billion), especially for the energy sector (about HTG4 billion).
    - ✓ Domestic investment is expected to increase by HTG10 billion to HTG25 billion. This is mainly due to increased disbursement on Petrocaribe projects (about HTG10 billion), and the launch of projects financed with resources from IMF debt relief (HTG2.7 billion out of a total relief of HTG10.7 billion).
    - ✓ The deficit excluding grants and externally financed projects is estimated at HTG25.3 billion (or 8.3 percent of GDP).
    - ✓ Government spending will continue to be financed with donor support (US\$135 million in grants) and the issuance of treasury bills (HTG4 billion).
    - ✓ The Ministry of Economy and Finance will continue to publish important information on revenue performances and execution of government spending.

28. The Minister of Finance expressed his agreement with the overall presentation by the IMF Representative as reflecting the discussions between the IMF and the government.

### **HRF Six-Month Progress Report**

29. The HRF Secretariat representative presented a brief powerpoint on the six-month progress report. He thanked the IDB, UN, World Bank, Canada, Norway, U.S., and the Trustee for their feedback on the report and the joint donor statement. The report serves to inform our clients and other stakeholders about the role, resources and performance of the HRF during its first six months of



operation. The report is divided into six chapters: chapter 1 and 2 provide the context and structure of the Fund; chapter 3 presents an overview of the HRF resources; chapter 4 details the portfolio and grant approval process; chapter 5 outlines the administration of the Fund and chapter 6 highlights early results. In addition to the report there will be a short executive summary brochure. Photos and logos from the photo and school competitions will be used to embellish the report. The report will be finalized by December 22 and printed by the end of the year. A launch ceremony will be held and all donors will be sent copies of the report. In addition, there will be targeted distribution to the media.

30. The Canadian representative congratulated the Secretariat on the idea of producing the report and for preparing a thorough document. He noted that Canada would need capital-level approval for signing the joint-donor statement. In addition to a number of small comments on the report, he mentioned specifically that it is important to describe the challenge faced by the Fund, namely to invest the funds rapidly but strategically. The Fund cannot just disburse funds but must ensure that funds are invested well.

31. The French representative noted that the report was very interesting. He requested that figure 2.1 and 2.2 be updated to reflect the discussions that have taken place since March, specifically regarding the criteria and process for selecting new partner entities. He also noted that the report refers only to the fees of the United Nations. As there are also IDB and WB fees, even though none have been charged to date, these should be referenced. Table 6.1 is key to showing the efficiency of this fund vis-a-vis other funds and is the key message that should be retained. The HRF Secretariat representative responded that comments had been received from the UN as well regarding the presentation of the fees and that the preparation and supervision cost fee scale would also be included. The United States representative stated that there was a little too much process-focused information in the report although this was understandable for a first progress report. He reiterated the importance of table 6.1.

32. The HRF Secretariat representative noted that the signatures and the name and title of the person to sign the joint-donor statement would be needed as quickly as possible. Subsequently, he put forth for SC discussion the question of whether donors that have officially approved their contribution to the HRF but have not yet been able to finalize Administration Agreements/Arrangements could have their flag included in the report. The Government of Japan had sent an official notice of the Japanese Diet's approval of their contribution to the HRF and would like their flag to be included in the report.

33. The chairperson noted that any donor that includes its flag should be ready to finalize its contribution to the Fund. He suggested that the period of the report either be elongated such that these donors could make true their promise or to leave the report's time period as is, in which case the report should highlight the fact that the donor's contribution is being processed. He sought feedback from the donor members of the Steering Committee. The Canadian representative asked when the signed Agreement with Japan was expected to be received. The HRF Secretariat representative explained that the Japanese contribution had been approved in the Diet but that they had not yet finalized their Agreement. He added that the policy should be the same for all donors who have officially confirmed

their contributions to the HRF – Japan (US\$30 million), Latvia (LVL33,000), Ireland (EUR1 million), Finland (EUR700,000) , Spain (US\$30 million) and Nigeria (US\$5 million).

34. For reporting purposes, it was decided that two tables would be included showing i) donors, that have signed an Administration Agreement/Arrangement, and ii) those that have officially approved contributions but which are still in the process of finalizing the Administration Agreement/Arrangement with the Trustee.

### **Review of Financing Requests from IHRC**

35. The chairperson moved on to the final agenda item, the review of financing requests received from the IHRC. Based on the concept notes and project summaries received the voting members of the SC members approved the setting aside of funding for each of the three proposals on the agenda. US\$65 million would be set aside for the Port-au-Prince Neighborhood Housing Project with the World Bank as the Partner Entity. US\$25 million would be set aside for the Demolition and Debris Removal with Heavy Equipment Project with the UN as the Partner Entity, and US\$2 million would be set aside for the Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management project with the UN as the Partner Entity.

36. The World Bank Representative added that for the Neighborhood Upgrading project a more detailed final project document was being prepared and would be sent to the Steering Committee in about two weeks. The Demolition and Debris Removal Project would be coordinated by UNDP with ILO, UN Habitat and UNOPS in collaboration with the Ministry of Public Works. The full project document would be submitted to the SC by mid-January. For the Disaster Risk Management Project the UN would be the Partner Entity and IOM would be the implementing agency.

37. In addition to the projects on the agenda, the IHRC co-chairs had approved a request for HRF funding of US\$10 million for an education sector project. The US\$10 million would contribute to a larger US\$250 million IDB project that had already been approved at the October 6 IHRC meeting and that would support the Ministry of Education's US\$4.5 billion plan. The SC approved the setting aside of the US\$10 million requested for the education project with the IDB as the Partner Entity.

38. **DECISION** : The Steering Committee conditionally approved US\$102 million in funding for four projects<sup>2</sup>. The funding for these projects will be set aside subject to submission by the Partner Entity of the full project document and approval thereof on a 5-day no-objection basis by the Steering Committee and subsequently by the IHRC.

---

<sup>2</sup> Reconstruction of the Education Sector (US\$10 million, IDB); Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management (US\$2 million, UN); Demolition and Debris Removal with Heavy Equipment (US\$25 million, UN); Port-au-Prince Neighborhood Housing Reconstruction Project (US\$65 million, WB)

39. The United States representative requested that, in the future, all project documents be provided to the SC in English as well French. The HRF Secretariat representative assured that this request would be passed on to the Partner Entities but that the Secretariat could not take responsibility for translating project documents as the Secretariat may then be held accountable by the Partner Entities for any errors in the translation. The IMF representative requested paragraphs be numbered in the minutes of this and future meetings.

### Other Business

40. The next meeting of the IHRC was anticipated to be held some time toward the end of January (around January 24). The next HRF SC meeting would thus be held the day after the IHRC meeting, ideally in Port-au-Prince.

### Closing

41. The HRF Secretariat thanked members and observers for their participation and patience with the videoconference technology. He specifically thanked the United Nations and the World Bank office in Santo Domingo for making their facilities available and Ms. Sarah Mondiere for making all necessary arrangements in Port-au-Prince.

42. The Chairperson noted that he would be in contact with the government of Brazil and other donors regarding the preferencing issue. He thanked MINUSTAH and the World Bank office in Santo Domingo for their hospitality and stated that the next meeting should take place physically in Port-au-Prince.

**Table: Decisions, Responsibilities and Timeframe**

Activity-Task	Action	Responsible	Timeframe
Approval of Minutes from Third SC meeting	Posting on Fund's website	Secretariat	Immediate
Set aside resources	Set aside \$40 million for eventual proposal for Artibonite 4C dam	Trustee	Immediate
Approval of Trustee Report	Posting on Fund's website	Secretariat	Immediate
Approval of funding requests	Notify Partner Entities of approval of funding requests	Secretariat	Immediate
Six-month Progress Report	Finalizing and printing of Six-month Progress Report	Secretariat	By end December
Preferencing	Follow up with donors on preferencing issue	Minister of Finance and Prime Minister	As soon as possible
Date of Next Steering	Agree on date for next HRF Steering	All	Depends on date of

Committee Meeting	Committee Meeting		next IHRC Board meeting
-------------------	-------------------	--	-------------------------

## ANNEX 1

### Representatives and Official Observers

#### **Représentants / Representatives**

##### **Membres votants / Voting members**

Government d'Haïti                      M. Ronald Baudin, Chairperson and Minister of Finance  
*Government of Haiti*                      M. Yves-Robert Jean

Brésil / *Brazil*                              M. Rubens Gama Dias Filho

Canada                                        M. David Moloney

Norvège / *Norway*                        M. Espen Rikter-Svendsen

Etats-Unis / *United States*            M. Tom Adams

##### **Entités Partenaires / Partner Entities**

BID / *IDB*                                      M. Peter Sollis

ONU / *UN*                                      M. Nigel Fisher (represented by Jessica Faieta/Nicolas Martin)

Banque Mondiale/  
*World Bank*                                  M. Alexandre Abrantes

##### **Agent Fiscal**

*Fiduciare/Trustee*                        Mme. Priya Basu

##### **Observateurs / Observers (Official)**

Local Authorities (Maires)            M. Joseph Gontran "Billy" Louis (absent)

Local Authorities (Casecs)            M. Raoul Pierre-Louis (absent)

Diaspora                                      M. Joseph M.G. Bernadel (absent)

National NGOs                            Mme. Carmèle Rose-Anne Auguste (absent)

International NGOs                    M. Philippe Bécoulet (represented by Mme. Carolyn Rose-Avila)

Private Sector                              M. Reginald Boulos (absent)

ANNEX 2



**Haiti Reconstruction Fund**  
A Fund for Recovery, Reconstruction and Development of Haiti



Steering Committee Meeting 4 / 2010

December 15, 2010  
Port-au-Prince/Santo Domingo  
09:00 – 12:00

**DRAFT AGENDA**

09:00 – 09:10	<b>Welcome by Chairperson</b>
09:10 – 09:45	<b>Remarks by IHRC Representative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Discussion of implications of the new IHRC strategy for HRF</li><li>- Discussion of donor preferencing</li></ul>
09:45 – 10:00	<b>Approval of Minutes of October 7, 2010 meeting</b>
10:00 – 10:30	<b>Brief Updates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Trustee</li><li>- Secretariat</li><li>- Partner Entities (on project implementation)</li></ul>
10:30 – 11:00	<b>HRF Six-Month Progress Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Presentation by Secretariat</li><li>-Discussion</li></ul>
11:00 – 11:45	<b>Review of Financing Requests from IHRC</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Proposal 1: Neighborhood Housing Reconstruction</li><li>-Proposal 2: Demolition and Debris Removal</li><li>- Proposal 3: Disaster Risk Management</li></ul>
11:45 – 12:00	<b>Other Business</b>
12:00	<b>Closing and lunch</b>