### Project Title:
Natural Disaster Mitigation in the South of Haiti
GPS: 18 10 52 22 N / 73 45 24 88 W

### Partner Entity:
IDB
IHRC Concept Note Number: CN-000145

### Project Development Objective:
To create the Macaya Natural Park and reduce the rapid environmental degradation of the upper watershed of the south western part of Haiti

### PARDH³ Sector:
Territorial Refoundation
IHRC Sector: Job creation

### Responsible Agency(s)²:
Ministry of Environment

### Total Project Cost (US$ million):
$12.4 Million

### Total Approved HRF Grant (US$ million):
$9 Million

### Total HRF Funds transferred to Partner Entity (US$ million):
$9 Million

### Other Donors (indicate amount per donor):
GEF $3.4 Million

### Project Funds disbursed (US$ million):
$6.88 Millions

### Disbursement as a percentage of total project cost:
55.3%

### HRF Funds disbursed (US$ million):
HRF $3,712,058.

### Disbursement of HRF funds as a percentage of approved HRF grant:
41%

### HRF SC Final Approval Date:
December, 2012

### Project Effectiveness Date³:
August, 2013

### Expected Project Duration:
4 years

### Expected Project Closing Date:
October, 2017

### Implementing Agency:
Type of Organization (Local/Int'l NGO, Government Agency, etc.):
Total project funding channeled through Implementing Agency (Planned or Actual):
Ministry of Environment
Government
US$ 12.4 Million

### Quantitative Results Indicators (include target):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Percentage of planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic losses due to flooding: - 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hectares with sustainable management: + 7,500</td>
<td>11,508</td>
<td>153.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local population benefiting from training and education on natural resources management and land use management: 10,000</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Plan d'Action pour le Relèvement et le Développement d’Haïti.
² Agency or Agencies that is/are the direct recipient of funds from the Partner Entity and is/are responsible for overseeing project implementation.
³ Date of fulfillment of all project effectiveness conditions and start of implementation of project activities.
Municipal land use plans established: 10

Replaced by the Management Plan for Macaya’s Park: 1

Macaya National Park management unit established: 1

1 100%

Park surveillance guards equipped, trained and mobilized: 20

37 185%

Macaya National Park limits established and accepted: 1

1 100%

Number of park unit and infrastructure built: 2

2 100%

Extension of areas protected from flooding: 750 ha

0 0%

Extension of vulnerable areas protected from soil erosion and land degradation: 500 ha

0 0%

Trees planted to restore native forest: 1,500,000

1 150 585 77%

New watershed protection structures installed:\n
4 338 912 260%

 GHG emissions and carbon stock monitored inside Macaya Park: 1

0 0%

Qualitative achievements against expected results:\n
- All the planned recruitments within the management plan have been done to reinforce the park team:
  - Eco-tourism specialist,
  - Conservation and Research assistant,
  - Education and public awareness specialist,
  - Chief of the park guards unit.

- For their second contract with the MOE, the partners in agroforestry have drafted their annual actions plan in accordance with the orientations of the park management plan. Their contracts have been signed in May and they have started their activities in June.

- After evaluating the group of surveillance guards (31 guards) and drafting a strategy for the enforcement in the park, 27 guards and a chief of the surveillance unit have been rehired. This process has been conjointly managed by the park management team, the national agency for protected areas and the national surveillance unit. A new surveillance deployment plan has been drafted and is being implemented. A new recruitment process is ongoing to hire 26 more guards. In addition to the 27 guards supported directly by the projects, the MOE provided 10 guards paid by the MOE but managed by the Park unit.

- The limit of the park will be extended by integrating the Grande Colline National Park (already covered by the Macaya park management plan). This extension of 3 227 ha will be delimited by physical boundaries by the end of 2016.

---

4 Considering a typical protection structure which dimensions are as follows:
- Length: 3m
- Height: 1.5 m
- Depth: 1 m

5 Include (i) qualitative achievements, (ii) key milestones (current or future) and (iii) any significant changes in project components or budget reallocations.
- Procurement process to recruit operators to draft the eco-tourism park strategy is under process. The firms should start in September, depending on contracts signatures delays. In the meantime, the eco-tourism specialist is working with the local communities in order to i) identify potential mountain guides (19 identified so far), ii) strengthen the existing mountain guides association in the park, iii) strengthen guides capacities to welcome and guide tourists in the park.

- GHG emission monitoring system: the firm in charge of this activity has done a field mission to identify the areas that will be monitored. Due to extreme degradation, the firm has proposed a new methodology (smaller areas) and will delimit them in September 2016 with the park team.

- The number of plants planted reaches almost **1,150,585** in the buffer zone of the park, which means more than **2701.05 hectares** of land, spread as follow:
  - 196,224 fruit trees - around 1,962.24 ha of land,
  - 300,427 coffee trees - around 150.21ha of land,
  - 653,934 forest trees – around 588.60 of land

- Procurement process to recruit operators to execute works for rural road’s improvement is done. The contracts have been signed in May 2016 and the firms have started their activities in July 2016.

---

**Challenges and other comments**:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges and risks</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new Minister of the MOE has been nominated in Mars. This nomination has had the effect of delaying contracting process with firms and partners in agroforestry.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mayors of local communities have not been nominated in October 2015 as planned. They were appointed in May 2016. Therefore the activities regarding communal infrastructures have been delayed.</td>
<td>The park team has evaluated the needs of local communities. Consultation with mayors will be done in August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Macaya technical and administrative management unit is in transition from a logic of project administration to a logic of park administration. According to preliminary estimates of Macaya Park Management Plan 2015-2020, about $15 million are needed to implement the 9 identified programs. If currently the management unit receives program funding from GEF, HRF the funding will end in September 2017.</td>
<td>Additional funding from UNEP should permit the implementation of several activities. The Macaya Park administration has started to identify, with local, national and international partners possible funding sources after 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology initially designed to monitor GHG emissions and carbon stock in the park is no longer accurate. Indeed, due to extreme degradation of the forest it is impossible to settle permanent monitoring areas (1 ha each) as planned.</td>
<td>The firm has proposed a new methodology with smaller monitoring areas. These areas will be delimited in September 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 As applicable include (i) reasons for project delays, (ii) implementation challenges, (iii) funding status (funding gaps, new funding sources, or changes to initial contributions), and (iv) other relevant information.