

January 22, 2014

Response of IBRD on Approval by mail: Haiti: Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project (PPCR) IBRD- Extension of Deadline

Dear Andrea and CIF AU team,

Please find attached the response matrix prepared by the IBRD task team in collaboration with the GoH, in response to the comments received from Germany/Spain and the UK on the above-referenced project.

We would be grateful if you could circulate this to the PPCR Sub-Committee for consideration. We are available for a phone call this week in case further clarifications are required.

Thank you and best wishes,

Kanta Kumari Rigaud

HAITI CENTRE ARTIBONITE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (P133352)

PPCR Sub Committee Approval, Review & Team Responses Summary matrix

January 20, 2014

Comments were received from the UK [UK], Germany and Spain [G/S] on January 10, 2014.

	Comments	Team's Response
1	<p>Conclusion/Decision from the Country Members:</p> <p>[UK] The UK welcomes this project and supports the allocation of PPCR funding to this initiative, although there are some concerns we would like to raise, and issues we would like to see addressed in implementation and in the rest of the SPCR.</p> <p>[G/S] From our point of view, there are thus major objections to the project, and we would like to see the project document revised prior to approval of the document by the PPCR sub-committee, taking into account our recommendations below (see bold highlights). [...] In summary, there appears to be rather little that sets the project design apart from a “standard issue” infrastructure improvement project, or in other words what makes it an adaptation project – which in turn raises the question why such a design would justify a PPCR investment. In no way do we mean to question the need for infrastructure improvement, particularly not given Haiti recent history of natural disasters – but such need does not automatically justify PPCR involvement. Before this background, we strongly recommend revisiting the project design and elaborating much more clearly the design elements specific to climate change adaptation – with changes to (a) budget allocation, (b) narrative and (c) results framework. The “project information” that was provided in section 2.5 of the SPCR might provide useful suggestions; and we also suggest considering our own earlier comments on the SPCR and on the proposed project.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comments provided. We have provided responses below and will continue to address these concerns during implementation.</p> <p>We have discussed your recommendations with the Government of Haiti (GoH) (including CIAT as the focal point of the SPCR, and project implementing agencies Technical Implementation Unit (UTE) from the Ministry of Economy and Finances (MEF), Central Implementation Unit (UCE) from the Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Energy and Communication (MTPTEC)) and have provided responses to your concerns below.</p> <p>PPCR-financed activities under Investment Project #1 were designed as an integral part of the IDA operation focusing on infrastructure improvement and economic stimulation in the Centre Artibonite Loop (CAL) Region, through the adoption of climate-proofing measures (through hard and soft investments). All too often in Haiti, reconstruction and rehabilitation investments have been rushed and have not taken into account climate variability affecting the country (and expected to increase as a result of climate change). During the last hurricane, some of the infrastructure collapses did occur due to changes in the hydraulic regimes of</p>

	Comments	Team's Response
		<p>rivers, associated with deforestation, with initial design that were developed decades ago and were relevant at that time. PPCR funds are seen by the GoH as an opportunity to mainstream climate resilience into the national planning process, pilot innovative solutions with the potential for replication, as well as generating knowledge to mitigate the risk of further impacts on major present and future infrastructure investments.</p> <p>Protecting investments in the road network with a climate-aware design (hard investments) and providing support to planners and policy-makers so they can make informed decisions that promote climate resilient development strategies (soft investments), is the strategic contribution of PPCR funds to this operation, and what makes it different from a <i>standard issue infrastructure improvement project</i>.</p> <p>Recommendations on how to make this rationale more apparent in the different sections of the PAD have been taken into account and will be incorporated to the extent possible.</p>
2	<p>Justification of PPCR funding?</p> <p>[UK] The case for PPCR funding of this project is not convincing. The project as described doesn't appear to meet the PPCR goal of catalysing a transformational shift to a climate resilient economy. It seems to be limited to making investments already planned (the IBRD/IDA operation) more climate resilient and sustainable, rather than informing strategic decisions on the investments themselves.</p>	<p>Haiti is a Fragile and Conflict-Afflicted State that has been repeatedly hit over the last decades by political, economic and natural disaster shocks. The 2010 earthquake was a major turning point encouraging the country to think about long term development and social and physical resilience to political, economic and climate change. The whole point of developing the CAL Region is based on the objective to have a more climate resilient economy, by creating new economic growth poles outside of Port au Prince, decentralizing the economic activity, lowering the demographic pressure from urban settlements and reducing the population's exposure to risk (over 85% of the population currently live in areas exposed to two or more natural hazards, and the five major cities are located in areas at high risk). In this context, the PPCR planning and investment process is helping to mainstream considerations of climate resilience from the outset in the economic growth plan of</p>

	Comments	Team's Response
	<p>Building in climate resilience to the building and refurbishment of infrastructure should be standard practice, why is the World Bank not doing this as a matter of course? How is PPCR funding justified for these activities, rather than standard development finance? It would be good to see the design of this and other projects following the principles of the new World Bank 'climate informed decision analysis' method[1].</p>	<p>the CAL Region. The development of this concept was made possible by the strong commitment and technical work from CIAT and the strong support from the CIF through the SCPR, without which the design of the Centre Artibonite Project would not have been as innovative and transformational for the country. Indeed, this conceptual collaboration between IDA and CIF led to 2 key decisions on the investments identified in the SPCR: (i) the development of a real and consolidated database (including climate and vulnerability related data) in a country where there is almost zero data or poor isolated data, that could inform decision making and guide key investments, and (ii) the decision to give priority to increasing all-weather access throughout this region, which would bring a transformational shift not only for the inhabitants of the region, but also for the people transiting South-North, and West-East. In a country with no hydro-meteorological services, no climate risk management plans, codes or regulations and virtually no institutional or technical capacity to produce simple climate scenarios and hydrological modeling that can inform basic decisions (such as the location and design of a bridge in a critical point of a road), the proposed investment supported by the PPCR is truly transformational for the CAL Region.</p> <p>Noted, with thanks. A more effective integration of climate risk screening into new IDA operations is indeed in the agenda of "Special Themes" for IDA17. IDA is developing Climate Risk Screening Tools and, where applicable, future operations will integrate appropriate resilience measures. Some screening tools specific for sensitive sectors (agriculture, water, coastal zones, roads) are currently being developed and piloted in select countries. The project task team will seek to apply Climate Risk Screening Tools developed for the infrastructure-road sectors during project preparation phase. Relevant experience in climate proofing of roads investments facilitated by PPCR in other countries (such as</p>

	Comments	Team's Response
	<p>[G/S] The proposed “Haiti Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project” puts enhancing all-weather connectivity and logistics for the agricultural sector at its core. We fully recognise that this is a key development issue in Haiti’s rural regions, and appreciate the effort that has gone into the project design.</p>	<p>Mozambique) will also be taken as a reference.</p> <p>Thank you. The relevance of agriculture (production, processing and marketing) is agreed and the project seeks to boost the potential for economic development opportunities along this sector’s supply chain. Project investment in road connectivity in the CAL Region will also potentially encourage development in other economic sectors and contribute to diversification of income and national resilience.</p>
3	<p>Lack of details in the analysis of likely climate impacts on the CAL region, and weak Results Framework</p> <p>[UK] The analysis of likely climate impacts on the CAL region is very brief and generalised. The need to articulate a climate resilient development plan is mentioned but not how this will be done or what it would look like. There is no mention of how this project will link to the other SPCR projects for Haiti or the Caribbean.</p>	<p>Further details on climate impacts in the CAL were provided in the description of Investment Project #1 in the SPCR. Further explanations will also be added to explain how Investment Project #1 is linked to other PPCR investment projects. Institutional support to strengthen CIAT’s capacities to coordinate and align investments within the SPCR will be provided. Under Investment Project #4, CIAT receives specific support to manage and share information and knowledge products at the PPCR program country level and at regional level with the Caribbean Regional PPCR program. Following the Strategic Elements of the SPCR (p75), a CIAT/PPCR task team will be set up to this end. Through this unit, CIAT will ensure the harmonization of all the SPCR projects and the analysis, evaluation, and dissemination of knowledge results. Thus, linkages between the sub-national, national and regional results from the project in connection with PPCR goals will be ensured. This is explained in Annex 3 of the PAD in a specific section of the Table describing the roles and competences of the different institutions involved in project implementation.</p>

	Comments		Team's Response
	<p>The PAD states that the project will mainstream context-specific 'climate resilience best practice' into technical guidelines for infrastructure and government training, but not how this best practice will be defined or identified. There are no measures in the results framework for increasing Government capacity on planning for climate change or use of climate information, or for breaking down the number of beneficiaries into those made more climate resilient.</p> <p>The long term and transformational impact of this project will relate more to the capacity development and knowledge sharing elements than the hard infrastructure, in terms of building the skills to design, implement and maintain these projects in the future. The plans for this are not that clear at the moment. How will the good practice and lessons learnt from building climate resilience measures into infrastructure work be shared and disseminated? What will be the legacy of this for the Haitian Government in terms of their ability to adapt?</p>		<p>Sector-specific Climate Risk Screening Tools (currently piloted through IDA operations in other countries), studies on climate proofing road networks undertaken in other Caribbean and Tropical countries (with PPCR funds), and other global references (such as the Asian Development Bank Guidelines for Climate Proofing Investments in the Transport Sector) are taken into account during project preparation to identify best practice and technical guidelines adaptable to the CAL context.</p> <p>The table of indicators is a proposed table to be confirmed (and reduced) at Appraisal with the Client. It is meant to capture the key development impacts. This work is still in progress, collaboratively with the Client. The following indicator (already in the proposed RF) of "number of projects developed using analytical data generated by the project" addresses the point raised. In any case, CIAT who received PPCR training on PPCR indicators, would make sure to use (and if necessary develop additional indicators) the indicators of the project to properly inform the PPCR core indicators.</p> <p>This is agreed. This investment project should not be understood as a stand-alone project, but in connection to the other SCPR investment projects. With regards to capacity development for climate proofing planning tools, the project will draw the link with PPCR Investment Project #4 that includes in its objectives: "4- Facilitating and energizing a well -informed and multi-stakeholder policy dialogue on climate resilience at the country level (...)" and "5- Ensuring institutional articulation and effective management to systematize and capitalize on initiatives developed as part of the PPCR and to share and disseminate relevant information and results obtained".</p>

Comments	Team's Response
<p>The elements on climate information and ‘technical knowledge of the territory’ (so called ‘soft investments’) are lacking in detail – what will this consist of and how will climate information be used in planning? Is this about generating weather and climate information, or converting this into tools for planning?</p> <p>[G/S] In terms of content, we find the proposal lacking some of the depth that could reasonably be expected from a PPCR proposal on how “the region’s resilience to climate change” would be improved through measures other than mere hard infrastructure investment, and how such improvements would be measured. For example, the “cover page for approval request” document mentions “climate-proofing investments in “poles of economic growth”” as one of the “specific objectives” of the proposes project – yet, the proposal remains rather vague on how such climate proofing would look like.</p>	<p>Generating weather and climate information for the CAL will be a necessary starting point, since quality information currently does not exist. This will not be undertaken in isolation through Investment Project #1, but supported by efforts at national level from the Hydromet sub-component under Investment Project #4. Climate variability scenarios and climate modeling as well as risk assessment are planning tools necessary to inform infrastructure investment decisions as well as the design of climate-proofing measures fit to context will be delivered by the project. Planning for climate resilience will not be developed in isolation but integrated into other decision-making tools, such as land-use planning of cost-benefit analysis.</p> <p>The CAL region’s resilience will be achieved through 3 main drivers: (1) the upgrading of transport infrastructures that ensure connectivity facilitating population access to services and facilitating economic development; (2) the adoption of measures to climate-proof those hard investments and avoid or mitigate the risk of future loss and damage as a result of extreme weather events; and (3) the strengthening of institutional technical capacities to prevent future impacts through a climate-aware development planning. A number of specific locations are specified in the PAD and correspond to poles of economic growth pre-identified by the GoH. Investments are planned in these particular areas, including a number of interventions that will target the upgrading or construction of urban and rural markets. Generic measures to climate-proof the road network (design of bridges making sure they are not undersized, drainage systems, protective nets in landslide prone areas, etc.) and the marketplace platforms (roofing and flooring to fit climate taking into account risk of strong winds, flooding, landslides, etc.) have been referred to in the PAD (p42-44). Concrete interventions to climate-proof each of the investments to be programmed will depend on specific location and on</p>

	Comments	Team's Response
	<p>Looking at the results framework, we find the linkages drawn between its indicators and the PPCR Core Indicators somewhat weak. For instance, how would the number of “spot interventions to enhance climate resilience of roads” indicate the “extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public sector services use improved PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies, activities to respond to climate variability and climate change”?</p>	<p>adaptation options engineered and adequate to the cultural context. Some preliminary options have been studied (in particular for markets and surrounding facilities) and will be detailed during project preparation and through the preparatory studies. Updates and further details on specific interventions will be provided as part of project implementation/monitoring reports.</p> <p>Enhancing the climate resilience of the road network will ensure an all-weather access to communication lines, connectivity and access to essential services (for the rural communities) and to local and regional markets for agricultural producers and processors. In the occurrence of future extreme weather events, interventions planned under this PPCR investment are expected to help reduce the vulnerability of households and communities (who, through fit roads, will be able to access evacuation routes and shelters, energy and water supply points and health services or post-emergency assistance) and the business continuity in the agriculture supply chain. They will also have helped improve resilience of the road network at a macro-level, by increasing the number of alternate routes to link major regions of the country (after Fay Gustav Hanna Ike 2008 hurricanes, the country was divided into areas that were cut off from one another for several months, due to the collapse of five major bridges on roads that were unique transit options).</p>
4	<p>Link with the other SPCR project of ‘Climate Proofing of Agriculture in the Centre Artibonite Region’?</p> <p>[G/S] The proposed PPCR “Haiti Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project”, with a volume of 8.0 million US\$, first and foremost constitutes the PPCR contribution to a larger, IDA financed infrastructure improvement project, with an overall volume of 58 million US\$. Of the PPCR contribution, 6.1 million US\$ will be hardware investments; 1.0 million US\$ will be used for technical assistance to the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Territorial Development (CIAT) including conducting analytical studies,</p>	<p>We agree that close coordination between the interventions planned under SPCR Investment Projects #1 and #2 is crucial for the development of the CAL region and to maximize the climate resilience benefits of the PPCR. The GoH, IBRD and IDB teams are working together to ensure the coherence of the interventions as part of the PPCR programmatic approach from the design phase and</p>

	Comments	Team's Response
	<p>setting up data bases, and developing guidelines; and 0.9 million US\$ will support capacity development at the local level. The infrastructure to be improved includes the Centre Artibonite region's road network and its urban and rural markets.</p> <p>By improving the infrastructure, the project aims at enhancing the access of inhabitants and agricultural producers to (selected) markets within the Centre Artibonite region. This will undoubtedly be an important strategy to spur economic growth in the region's agricultural sector. It needs to be complemented, however, by climate proofing of agriculture in the region, as better market access will not necessarily contribute to more climate resilience, if the upstream (i.e. production) parts of the agricultural value chain are not made climate resilient as well. Thus, we would have welcomed to review both projects, the "Haiti Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project" and the "Climate Proofing of Agriculture in the Centre Artibonite Region" project (as outlined in the SPCR), in conjunction. The latter might contain adaptation-specific elements which in our view appear to be lacking in the former (see further comments below).</p>	<p>through to implementation. In particular, in order to facilitate future complementarities and synergies between the two CAL projects, the sites of agricultural production and agricultural processing have been mapped and taken into account as criteria for the identification of key investments in CAL infrastructures (both critical points in the road network and rural/urban markets) under Investment Project #1. As the focal point for PPCR at GoH level, CIAT is in charge of ensuring the coherence of the PPCR program and has been coordinating and overseeing the development of the investment projects in the Centre Artibonite Region and across the investments identified in the SPCR. CIAT PPCR Coordination Unit will ensure that the programmatic approach will continue throughout implementation.</p>
5	<p>Concern about the thematic areas and the PPCR contribution</p> <p>[G/S] The "cover page for approval request" document (as provided) lists the following five major thematic areas, in which the proposed project would make contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) enhancing transport connectivity between the Centre Artibonite region and other regions; (ii) enhancing the access of inhabitants and agricultural producers to selected markets by improving internal connectivity within the Centre Artibonite region as well as selected market facilities; (iii) developing regional knowledge and tools to enable public and private actors in the region to better plan investments and activities; (iv) improving the region's resilience to climate change; (v) providing the Government of Haiti with resources and capacity to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible emergency. <p>Regarding thematic areas (i) and (ii), the proposal explains quite clearly how significant contributions in these areas would be made. Also, these are the thematic areas which most of the PPCR resources would flow into (at least 6.1 of 8 million US\$ in total). Regarding thematic area (v), it appears from the cost and financing overview that the PPCR grant actually makes no contribution to the project's "Contingent Emergency</p>	

Comments	Team's Response
<p>Response Component". If that was indeed correct, we would suggest dropping the reference to providing capacity to respond to emergencies, or at least clarifying that the PPCR will make no contribution in this area.</p> <p>Regarding thematic areas (iii) and (iv), we note that only 1.9 million US\$ appear to have been allocated here at the most, which would be equivalent to only 24% of the PPCR grant, or only 4% of overall project volume (58 million US\$). This raises serious concerns, as support in the thematic areas (iii) and particularly (iv) is probably closer to the PPCR's key mandate to "to pilot and demonstrate ways to integrate climate risk and resilience into core development planning" than mere investments in hard infrastructure as envisaged in thematic areas (i) and (ii); in particular when considering that the bulk of IDA financing (at least 37.9 million US\$ or 75% of total IDA investment) is already being used for support in thematic areas (i) and (ii). (By comparison, in the original SPCR document, significantly more of the PPCR grant resources – 3 million US\$ (out of 8) instead of 1.9 – had tentatively been allocated for "creating an enabling environment" under the project "Climate Proofing of Infrastructures in the Centre-Artibonite Loop", as it was called at the time of completing the SPCR.)</p>	<p>This is correct and reflected in all the tables showing project costs and financing sources throughout the document. That summary section is meant to describe the cofinanced project as a whole, and is generated by the Bank system. If needed, an additional way to clarify that the PPCR will make no contribution to the Contingent Emergency Response Component will be considered.</p> <p>Budget allocations estimated for Investment Project #1 at the time of SPCR formulation were revised following the detailed project preparation process. The rationale for the revisions found in the December PAD was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hard investments into infrastructure climate proofing measures (roads, markets) would logically absorb more financial resources than soft investments. A demonstration effect at national level (targeting the GoH and international investors) is sought through the piloting of climate resilient approaches in infrastructure development in the CAL; - "Creating an enabling environment" and building the capacities of national and local institutions to develop planning tools and knowledge products that would facilitate the mainstreaming of climate risk management into decision making processes and development planning and knowledge management, remains a key expected outcome of the project. Yet, to this end, soft investments from the CAL project would be supplemented and complemented by institutional strengthening and technical support activities at national scale under Investment Project #4. <p>Activities under thematic areas (iii) and (iv) are also expected to be less costly (from a financial point of view) than activities under thematic areas (i) and (ii).</p>

	Comments	Team's Response
		<p>Amounts provided in the December PAD for CIF were estimates, and have been since revisited with the Client including CIAT, taking into consideration CIF's comments. It was decided to transfer CIF US\$1.5 million from Component 1 to Component 3. As of January 17, the project costs and financing for the first 3 Components are the following: US\$37 million for Enhancing logistics, transport connectivity and climate resilience (Component 1), including US\$4.5 million from CIF; US\$10 million for Improving infrastructure and management of markets (Component 2), including US\$0.5 million from CIF; and US\$6 million for Supporting the development of territorial knowledge, planning capacity and local participation (Component 3), including US\$3 million from CIF.</p>
6	<p>Targeting the poorest and most vulnerable?</p> <p>[UK] How will the project ensure it targets the poorest and most vulnerable? There is a risk they will be sidelined with the focus on producers that already have access to agricultural land. There seems to be a major opportunity to increase climate resilience through climate proofing road access to social and health services for vulnerable communities (para 11 of the PAD) but this is only mentioned as a side benefit and not measured. There could also be opportunities to improve the climate resilience of the major towns through informing urban planning and building regulations in targeted municipalities.</p>	<p>Agricultural producers and small-holders that sell their products in the rural and urban markets of the CAL or supply the processing plants are among the poor and vulnerable in Haiti. As stated in the PAD, the Centre Artibonite is one of the poorest region of the country and agricultural producers in the area are the poorest (medium size of exploitation is 0.5Ha).</p> <p>The project seeks to build resilience, not just by upgrading and climate proofing infrastructures, but also by spurring economic growth in the CAL region and attracting private sector investors. The agriculture supply chain was identified as a potential (and main) driver to encourage economic development and investments were articulated around this focus to avoid dispersion of efforts. The investments in the road network contribute to ensuring connectivity and enhancing access of poor rural households to essential services in urban areas of the CAL.</p>

	Comments	Team's Response
7	<p>Institutional capacity building and M&E:</p> <p>[UK] Good that the headline results breakdown the number of people reached into direct and indirect figures. Welcome fact that project includes a significant component on institutional capacity building for M and E.</p>	Thank you.
8	<p>Gender analysis</p> <p>[UK] Good that some results targets are broken down by gender, but the gender analysis is quite thin, and women's empowerment (e.g. in decision making on selection of roads to improve) does not appear to be measured.</p> <p>[G/S] The indicators of the results framework, in some instances, differentiate by gender, however either only at a very aggregate level (access to all season roads, direct project beneficiaries) or at the level of project outputs (number of people trained). We would like to see more gender differentiation at the process level, in particular in Component 3. Supporting the development of regional knowledge, planning capacity and local participation. For instance, the degree to which women participate in consultation activities or in urban planning should be reflected in the results framework's indicators.</p>	<p>Agreed. The lack of gender- disaggregated data has been acknowledged as a difficulty in the formulation since the SPCR phase.</p> <p>The Borrower is planning to undertake a socio-economic and gender analysis study (as part of preparatory work) to identify opportunities for further engagement of women in project activities and to better assess the gender-disaggregated impacts of the project.</p> <p>The Regional Caribbean PPCR has undertaken similar studies (at a larger scale) and the team will seek guidance and lessons learned from that experience for the Haitian PPCR.</p>

Written comments received

COMMENTS FROM THE UK

From: "Juliet Field" <J-Field@dfid.gov.uk>

Date: January 10, 2014 at 6:05:19 AM EST

To: "cifadminunit@worldbank.org" <cifadminunit@worldbank.org>, "akutter@worldbank.org" <akutter@worldbank.org>

Cc: "Ben Green" <B-Green@dfid.gov.uk>, "Anna Bobin" <a-bobin@dfid.gov.uk>, "Alex Harvey" <A-Harvey@dfid.gov.uk>, "Simon Lucas" <S-Lucas@dfid.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Approval by mail: Haiti: Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project (PPCR) IBRD

Dear Colleagues

The UK welcomes this project and supports the allocation of PPCR funding to this initiative, although there are some concerns we would like to raise, and issues we would like to see addressed in implementation and in the rest of the SPCR:

- The case for PPCR funding of this project is not convincing. The project as described doesn't appear to meet the PPCR goal of catalysing a transformational shift to a climate resilient economy. It seems to be limited to making investments already planned (the IBRD/IDA operation) more climate resilient and sustainable, rather than informing strategic decisions on the investments themselves. Building in climate resilience to the building and refurbishment of infrastructure should be standard practice, why is the World Bank not doing this as a matter of course? How is PPCR funding justified for these activities, rather than standard development finance? It would be good to see the design of this and other projects following the principles of the new World Bank 'climate informed decision analysis' method[1].
- The analysis of likely climate impacts on the CAL region is very brief and generalised. The need to articulate a climate resilient development plan is mentioned but not how this will be done or what it would look like. There is no mention of how this project will link to the other SPCR projects for Haiti or the Caribbean. The PAD states that the project will mainstream context-specific 'climate resilience best practice' into technical guidelines for infrastructure and government training, but not how this best practice will be defined or identified. There are no measures in the results framework for increasing Government capacity on planning for climate change or use of climate information, or for breaking down the number of beneficiaries into those made more climate resilient.
- The long term and transformational impact of this project will relate more to the capacity development and knowledge sharing elements than the hard infrastructure, in terms of building the skills to design, implement and maintain these projects in the future. The plans for this are not that clear at the moment. How will the good practice and lessons learnt from building climate resilience measures into infrastructure work be shared and disseminated? What will be the legacy of this for the Haitian Government in terms of their ability to adapt?

- The elements on climate information and ‘technical knowledge of the territory’ (so called ‘soft investments’) are lacking in detail – what will this consist of and how will climate information be used in planning? Is this about generating weather and climate information, or converting this into tools for planning?
- How will the project ensure it targets the poorest and most vulnerable? There is a risk they will be sidelined with the focus on producers that already have access to agricultural land. There seems to be a major opportunity to increase climate resilience through climate proofing road access to social and health services for vulnerable communities (para 11 of the PAD) but this is only mentioned as a side benefit and not measured. There could also be opportunities to improve the climate resilience of the major towns through informing urban planning and building regulations in targeted municipalities.
- Good that the headline results breakdown the number of people reached into direct and indirect figures. Welcome fact that project includes a significant component on institutional capacity building for M and E
- Good that some results targets are broken down by gender, but the gender analysis is quite thin, and women’s empowerment (e.g. in decision making on selection of roads to improve) does not appear to be measured

Many thanks

Juliet

COMMENTS FROM GERMANY

From: "Annette Windmeisser" <Annette.Windmeisser@bmz.bund.de>

Date: January 10, 2014 at 9:23:07 AM EST

To: cifadminunit@worldbank.org

Cc: "Frank Fass-Metz" <Frank.Fass-Metz@bmz.bund.de>, christoph.feldkoetter@giz.de, "Rafael Dominguez Pabon" <rafael.dominguez@mineco.es>, akutter@worldbank.org

Subject: : Approval by mail: Haiti: Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project (PPCR) IBRD

Dear Haiti team,

on behalf of Spain and Germany thank you very much for your above mentioned project proposal. Unfortunately we feel not in a position to agree to the proposal right now. We would be grateful to be able to discuss details further. Pls find comments attached.

All the best

**Joint Spanish and German Comments on proposed project:
Haiti
Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project**

Summary

The proposed “Haiti Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project” puts enhancing all-weather connectivity and logistics for the agricultural sector at its core. We fully recognise that this is a key development issue in Haiti’s rural regions, and appreciate the effort that has gone into the project design.

We are concerned, however, that there appears to be rather little that sets the project design apart from a “standard issue” infrastructure improvement project, which in turn raises the question why such a design would justify a PPCR investment. In no way do we mean to question the need for infrastructure improvement, particularly not given Haiti recent history of natural disasters – but such need does not automatically justify PPCR involvement.

From our point of view, there are thus **major** objections to the project, and we would like to see the project document revised **prior to approval** of the document by the PPCR sub-committee, taking into account our recommendations below (see **bold** highlights).

Individual Comments on the Proposed Project

The proposed PPCR “Haiti Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project”, with a volume of 8.0 million US\$, first and foremost constitutes the PPCR contribution to a larger, IDA financed infrastructure improvement project, with an overall volume of 58 million US\$. Of the PPCR contribution, 6.1 million US\$ will be hardware investments; 1.0 million US\$ will be used for technical assistance to the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Territorial Development (CIAT) including conducting analytical studies, setting up data bases, and developing guidelines; and 0.9 million US\$ will support capacity development at the local level. The infrastructure to be improved includes the Centre Artibonite region’s road network and its urban and rural markets.

By improving the infrastructure, the project aims at enhancing the access of inhabitants and agricultural producers to (selected) markets within the Centre Artibonite region. This will undoubtedly be an important strategy to spur economic growth in the region’s agricultural sector. It needs to be complemented, however, by climate proofing of agriculture in the region, as better market access will not necessarily contribute to more climate resilience, if the upstream (i.e. production) parts of the agricultural value chain are not made climate resilient as well. Thus, we would have welcomed to review both projects, the “Haiti Centre Artibonite Regional Development Project” and the “Climate Proofing of Agriculture in the Centre Artibonite Region” project (as outlined in the SPCR), in conjunction. The latter might contain adaptation-specific elements which in our view appear to be lacking in the former (see further comments below).

The “cover page for approval request” document (as provided) lists the following five major thematic areas, in which the proposed project would make contributions:

- (vi) enhancing transport connectivity between the Centre Artibonite region and other regions;
- (vii) enhancing the access of inhabitants and agricultural producers to selected markets by improving internal connectivity within the Centre Artibonite region as well as selected market facilities;
- (viii) developing regional knowledge and tools to enable public and private actors in the region to better plan investments and activities;
- (ix) improving the region’s resilience to climate change;
- (x) providing the Government of Haiti with resources and capacity to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible emergency.

Regarding thematic areas (i) and (ii), the proposal explains quite clearly how significant contributions in these areas would be made. Also, these are the thematic areas which most of the PPCR resources would flow into (at least 6.1 of 8 million US\$ in total). Regarding thematic area (v), it appears from the cost and financing overview that the PPCR grant actually makes no contribution to the project’s “Contingent Emergency Response Component”. **If that was indeed correct, we would suggest dropping the reference to providing capacity to respond to emergencies, or at least clarifying that the PPCR will make no contribution in this area.**

Regarding thematic areas (iii) and (iv), we note that only 1.9 million US\$ appear to have been allocated here at the most, which would be equivalent to only 24% of the PPCR grant, or only 4% of overall project volume (58 million US\$). This raises serious concerns, as support in the thematic areas (iii) and particularly (iv) is probably closer to the PPCR’s key mandate to “to pilot and demonstrate ways to integrate climate risk and resilience into core development planning” than mere investments in hard infrastructure as envisaged in thematic areas (i) and (ii); in particular when considering that the bulk of IDA financing (at least 37.9 million US\$ or 75% of total IDA investment) is already being used for support in thematic areas (i) and (ii). (By comparison, in the original SPCR document, significantly more of the PPCR grant resources – 3 million US\$ (out of 8) instead of 1.9 – had tentatively been allocated for “creating an enabling environment” under the project “Climate Proofing of Infrastructures in the Centre-Artibonite Loop”, as it was called at the time of completing the SPCR.)

In terms of content, we find the proposal lacking some of the depth that could reasonably be expected from a PPCR proposal on how “the region’s resilience to climate change” would be improved through measures other than mere hard infrastructure investment, and how such improvements would be measured. For example, the “cover page for approval request” document mentions “climate-proofing investments in “poles of economic growth”” as one of the “specific objectives” of the proposed project – yet, the proposal remains rather vague on how such climate proofing would look like. Looking at the results framework, we find the linkages drawn between its indicators and the PPCR Core Indicators somewhat weak. For instance, how would the number of “spot interventions to enhance climate resilience of roads” indicate the “extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public sector services use improved PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies, activities to respond to climate variability and climate change”?

In summary, there appears to be rather little that sets the project design apart from a “standard issue” infrastructure improvement project, or in other words what makes it an adaptation project – which in turn raises the question why such a design would justify a PPCR investment. In no way do we mean to question the need for infrastructure improvement, particularly not given Haiti recent history of natural disasters – but such need does not automatically justify PPCR involvement. **Before this background, we strongly recommend revisiting the project design and elaborating much more clearly the design elements specific to climate change adaptation – with changes to (a) budget allocation, (b) narrative and (c) results framework.** The “project information” that was provided in section 2.5 of the SPCR might provide useful suggestions; and we also suggest considering our own earlier comments on the SPCR and on the proposed project.

Comments on Cross-Cutting Issues

Gender

The indicators of the results framework, in some instances, differentiate by gender, however either only at a very aggregate level (access to all season roads, direct project beneficiaries) or at the level of project outputs (number of people trained). **We would like to see more gender differentiation at the process level, in particular in *Component 3. Supporting the development of regional knowledge, planning capacity and local participation*.** For instance, the degree to which women participate in consultation activities or in urban planning should be reflected in the results framework’s indicators.