

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	BirdLife International
Project Title:	Post-Earthquake Environmental Support for the Haitian NGO Sector
Date of Report:	2 July 2012
Report Authors and Contact Information	David Wege (david.wege@birdlife.org) Arnaud Dupuy (amdupuy@yahoo.com) Joel Timyan (timyan.sah@gmail.com)

CEPF Region: Caribbean Islands-Haiti

Strategic Direction: Emergency Support to Haiti

Grant Amount: US\$251,354

Project Dates: 1 October, 2010 to 31 January, 2012. No-cost project extension to 30 April, 2012

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

Under BirdLife International's overall project coordination there was one formal partner – Société Audubon Haïti (SAH) – that had the direct responsibility to implement two of the three components of the project under the terms of a sub-contract between SAH and BirdLife International. This organization was selected as a project partner for four primary reasons:

- because of their past and current involvement in conservation and community development in Haiti;
- because of their legitimacy at national and community levels;
- because of their capacity to manage specific components of the project; and
- because of the benefits they will gain from the project, in terms of capacity-building and post-earthquake rehabilitation.

Société Audubon Haïti (SAH) implemented two components of the project on behalf of the community of Haitian environmental civil society organizations currently grouped under an informal umbrella known as the Rézo-Ekolo. The sub-contracting of SAH for specific components of the project was done purely for the purpose of effective and efficient project management, but BirdLife and all members of the Rézo-Ekolo network remained committed to planning and implementing all project activities as elements of an integrated strategy aimed at strengthening the environmental civil society sector in Haiti and its ability to respond to some of the challenges and opportunities arising from the earthquake of 12 January 2010.

The 12 Rézo-Ekolo network members are:

- Société Audubon Haïti (SAH)
- Association Paysans Vallée (APV) (Petit-Goâve)
- Fondation Ecosophique haïtienne
- Fondation Haïtienne de l'Environnement (FHE)
- Fédération des Amis de la Nature (FAN)
- Fondation Macaya pour le Développement Local
- Fondation Seguin
- Groupe 73
- Groupe d'Action Francophone pour l'Environnement (GAFFE)
- Haïti Environnement et Développement

- Organisation pour la Réhabilitation de l'Environnement (ORE)
- Réseau des Professionnel d'Intervention en Education (REPIE)

With close links to the network (but not currently members of it) are:

- Comité d'Union et de Support aux Municipalités (CUSM)
- Fondation Connaissance et Liberté (FOKAL)
- Panos Caraïbes

SAH is a not-for-profit foundation established in July 2003 as an initiative of a group of local experts concerned with the degradation of the country's ecosystems and committed to contributing to their preservation and restoration. SAH has facilitated and supported a large number of scientific studies on Haiti's biodiversity, such as the survey of native mammals carried out in 2007 in collaboration with the Zoological Society of London, and is active in several parts of the country, particularly in Massif de la Hotte, where it works with local communities and with support from BirdLife International in community development and habitat restoration. Some of its past and current activities in Massif de la Hotte include the establishment of six tree nurseries, the production of more than 200,000 seedlings, the conservation of natural fresh-water springs, and the provision of education and potable water to the Formon community. SAH is presently working with the Ministry of the Environment to develop a long-term conservation strategy for the Massif de la Hotte.

In addition to SAH and the Rézo-Ekolo network, a number of other stakeholders were engaged through this project. In particular, the project complemented and benefited from the financing and technical assistance provided to Haiti and Haitian institutions by a number of other donors, including:

- The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), especially through its Watershed Initiative for National Natural Environmental Resources (WINNER project), with several current or proposed activities that relate to the KBAs of southern Haiti, including the proposed provision of support to the Ministry of Environment for strengthening protected area surveillance.
- The Programme de Préservation et de Valorisation de la Biodiversité en haute altitude (DDC/Helvetas/Fondation Seguin).
- The Project Araucaria XXI for biodiversity conservation and sustainable development in the south-east of Haiti, funded by Spain's agency for international cooperation (AECID).
- The IDB-funded project on Sustainable Land Management of the Upper Watersheds of South Western Haiti, as well as the Programme national de gestion des bassins versants which includes watersheds partially covering the KBAs.
- The McArthur funded project to support Foundation Audubon development (with BirdLife, \$ 250,000).
- The Haiti Regeneration Initiative, piloted by UNEP in collaboration with the Earth Institute at Columbia University (but not currently active on the ground).
- The United Nations Development Program /Global Environment Facility (UNDP/GEF) funded project "Système National des Aires Protégées financièrement soutenable" ("Sustainably funded National Protected Areas System") with several activities related to the KBAs.
- UNDP watershed management initiatives in the South-east and the South.
- The Darwin Initiative "threatened vertebrates" project (with BirdLife International, Durrell Wildlife, Zoological Society London; US\$450,000) with research and conservation activities focused on Massif de la Hotte.

The project did not have any formal contractual relationship with these initiatives, but it worked to foster active collaboration whenever appropriate and it ensured that information was shared and that opportunities for synergies and complementarity were systematically explored, both at the national and local levels.

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

- Scientific information (including full threatened species lists and newly-mapped boundaries) on a fully-revised network of Key Biodiversity Areas in Haiti are now available in French, Creole and English (a 50-page document, translated into three languages, is currently being validated).
- A revised set of priority KBAs have been recommended to, and accepted by CEPF.
- The strategic plan, mission and vision for Rézo-Ekolo have been developed using a participatory approach.
- The Rézo-Ekolo network is now legally recognised in Haiti.
- The project has played a catalytic role in increasing interaction between members of Rézo-Ekolo and has also clarified Rézo-Ekolo's legal structure, vision and mission.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):

1. Biodiversity conservation and natural resource management will be placed high on the reconstruction and development planning agendas in Haiti.
2. Favorable conditions will be created for the effective implementation of the CEPF investment strategy and of other interventions aimed at conservation and sustainable development in and near Haiti's Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), especially those of Massif de la Hotte and Massif de la Selle.

Actual Progress Towards Long-term Impacts at Completion:

- Increased awareness regarding the need for environmental protection at the state and civil society levels.
- Conference meeting held with President Martelly's administration to deliver and make public an *Environmental Manifesto* presented by the Rézo-Ekolo (June, 2011).
- Support of government and NGO environmental initiatives to increase public awareness.
- Translation into three languages and publication of *Key Biodiversity Areas of Haiti* – setting an objective, scientifically-robust agenda for site-based biodiversity conservation in Haiti.
- Haitian KBAs incorporated as an integral part of the developing National System of Protected Areas plan (under development through a UNDP-GEF project).
- New priority KBAs recommended and accepted for CEPF investments.
- Regular meetings among members representing environmental issues of civil-society in Haiti.
- Legal recognition of Rézo-Ekolo as a Haitian association (being finalised).
- Strategic plan, mission and vision of Rézo-Ekolo (being finalised).

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):

1. The civil society organizations that are directly involved in biodiversity conservation and integrated development in the Massif de la Hotte and Massif de la Selle (Haiti Audubon Society, Fondation Seguin and Fondation Macaya) have developed a strategy for strategic, post-earthquake intervention in these priority KBAs.
2. The network of environmental civil society organizations, Rézo-Ekolo, has become a recognized and effective actor in conservation, post-earthquake reconstruction and sustainable development in Haiti.
3. The members of the Rézo-Ekolo, either individually or in partnerships, formulate at least 10 proposals for funding to diversify their funding sources and build their (and the Rézo-Ekolo's) organizational capacity to address post-earthquake biodiversity conservation issues, and mainstream biodiversity into reconstruction plans.

4. Thanks to the information and documentation produced and disseminated by the project, key opinion leaders (at least one journalist in each of the main media houses), and senior policy makers and managers in all the main national agencies (CIAT; Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development; Ministry of Economy and Finance; Ministry of Planning and External Cooperation; Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications; Bureau des Mines et de l'Énergie; Ministry of Tourism) and development partners (World Bank, IDB, US Embassy and USAID, Canadian Embassy and CIDA, French Embassy and AFD, Spanish Embassy and AECID, German Embassy, Swiss Cooperation), have been formally introduced to the KBAs, their importance and their conservation needs.
5. Biodiversity conservation and natural resource management concerns at KBAs are mainstreamed into the statements and strategies of the Interim Commission for the Reconstruction of Haiti (ICRH), and the ICRH has approved funding for at least two projects or programs that will address conservation and natural resource management needs in the KBAs and at national level.
6. Projects, plans and policies formulated and implemented by Haitian institutions and their international partners take biodiversity conservation and natural resource management more directly into account, with specific reference to and investment in the KBAs included in at least three new donor strategies or projects as a result of the information disseminated to them by the Rézo-Ekolo and its members.
7. Haitian biodiversity conservation expertise is used more systematically and more effectively in reconstruction and development planning processes, especially by multilateral and bilateral development partners.
8. The score of the principal civil society partner on the CEPF institutional scorecard (and BirdLife NGO Health Check) has improved by 5%.

Actual Progress toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

1. A strategy for post-earthquake intervention (by civil society organizations) in the Massif de la Hotte and Massif de la Selle KBAs was completed in November 2010.
2. The Rézo-Ekolo network of environmental civil society organizations is becoming recognized nationally. Further progress will be facilitated with the legal recognition of the Rézo-Ekolo and also the completion of the strategic plan which will ensure the network provides strategic interventions concerning conservation, post-earthquake reconstruction and sustainable development in Haiti.
3. The members of the Rézo-Ekolo have not delivered successful proposals to date. A number of proposals were developed (three) in November 2010, but not submitted. More proposals are currently being developed. This area of work was not completed due to the lack of a functional administration unit. The Rézo-Ekolo coordinator that was recruited and hired in January 2011 resigned in April 2011 and was not replaced by a full-time individual.
4. The fully-revised KBA analysis is printed and ready for distribution in French and English, but has yet to be distributed or made available for download from the web. The Creole version is ready to be printed.
5. Biodiversity conservation and natural resource management concerns at KBAs have not been mainstreamed into the strategies of the Interim Commission for the Reconstruction of Haiti (ICRH), and this output is considered unrealistic.
6. As the KBA information has yet to be disseminated formally, institutional plans and donor strategies have yet to incorporate these site-based biodiversity priorities. However, KBAs have been fully incorporated into the developing National System of Protected Areas project (funded by UNDP-GEF). The proposed protected areas account for all the KBAs which will provide a lasting impact on the biodiversity conservation landscape in Haiti.
7. The Rézo-Ekolo has been unable to participate in getting Haitian biodiversity conservation expertise used more systematically and more effectively in reconstruction and development planning processes (e.g. by multilateral and bilateral development partners). However, the KBAs have been built into the UNDP-GEF funded National System of Protected Areas plan.
8. The Rézo-Ekolo was unable to respond to the scoring of institutional variables (through the CEPF institutional scorecard and BirdLife's NGO Health Check). As an institution, the Rézo-Ekolo has only just (at the end of the project) been legally recognized.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: NA
Species Conserved: NA
Corridors Created: NA

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

- The project activities planned during the project design phase were too ambitious and unrealistic given the available resources and the reality of the post-earthquake situation in the country.
- The process of developing the Rézo-Ekolo was not properly conceived or managed. The Rézo-Ekolo administrative unit was recruited without a clear and coherent governance structure, statutes, legal recognition, long-term financial support, administrative procedures and other necessary factors for a fully functional organization.
- Political, economic and social instability was not anticipated to last from 2010 through 2012, and flexibility to respond to this instability was not built into the project design.
- Relying on one institution (SAH) to drive the project forward nationally – without any financial benefit and within the context of post-earthquake Port-au-Prince was asking too much.
- The provision of project coordination by BirdLife proved almost impossible within the Haitian capacity vacuum created by the earthquake. In combination with the unrealistic institutional ask of SAH to manage activities on the ground, an excessive amount of time was invested by BirdLife to try and move the project forward. This time investment lasted throughout the project yet the Impacts were not as initially conceived – even with a no-cost project extension.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

- The incorporation of KBAs in the National System of Protected Areas plan was an unexpected positive output which will have long-lasting impacts once the plan is implemented.

Project Components

Project Components: *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned:

Strengthening of the Rézo-Ekolo, helping its members to rebuild their capacity and operations following the earthquake, and building the Rézo-Ekolo's capacity to play an active role in advocacy, policy formulation and provision to support to environmental civil society organizations in Haiti.

[Under subcontract to Haiti Audubon Society]

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

There was insufficient institutional capacity for SAH to execute this role. SAH was in a delicate stage of its own institutional development, and over the two years since the earthquake, SAH has indeed developed through the establishment of an office, a full-time Executive Director and four staff, but was unable to effectively support the Rézo-Ekolo during this very difficult time in Haiti. SAH was however able to help the Rézo-Ekolo to identify the necessary resources to assist with its institutional structure and organisation (such as its strategic plan and legal status).

Component 2 Planned:

Mainstreaming of conservation and environmental concerns into reconstruction policy and processes

[Under sub-contract to Haiti Audubon Society]

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

Key Biodiversity Areas of Haiti published and ready for dissemination, advocacy and integration with development programs and project implementation. The document incorporates datasheets for each KBA with mapped KBA boundaries and lists of globally threatened (IUCN Red Listed) species present in each site. An *Environmental Manifesto* was published in *La Nouvelliste* and on the Internet. KBAs have been built into the National System of Protected Areas plan (UNDP-GEF funded project).

Component 3 Planned:

Developing a strategy for addressing conservation and livelihood needs in Haiti's priority KBAs.

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

A strategy and niche for investment was defined for priority actions in the Massif de la Hotte and Massif de la Selle KBAs, focusing on immediate conservation and livelihood needs, and longer-term strategic opportunities.

Component 4 Planned:

Supporting the implementation of the project and enhancing the effectiveness and sustainability of all interventions.

Component 4 Actual at Completion:

CEPF's reporting and management requirements were fully met and financial policies were applied. However, planned activities were not all executed, and frequently not executed in a timely fashion (for reasons highlighted above). The essence of most of the project components was effectively implemented, but not all deliverables were achieved leading to a revision of the project outputs and a revised contract for a no-cost project extension of three months. Significant impacts were achieved in some areas, but not all. Access to technical assistance and expertise was accessible to the project partner (and the Rézo-Ekolo network) at all times, and was provided constantly in relation to reporting requirements, examples of institutional strategies, plans, terms of reference for staff etc. Significant technical input and support was provided for the development of the KBA document in terms of adherence to KBA criteria, site definition, mapping, KBA profile structure. The new KBA information is all available through the World Biodiversity Database. Significant strides were made in enhancing the effectiveness and sustainability of Rézo-Ekolo by organizing two network retreats in March 2012 that resulted in the selection of a consultant to prepare a strategic plan and built consensus regarding the vision, mission and strategic objectives of the organization. Simultaneously, legal work was accomplished by Hudicort-Wooley law firm to establish the statutes and structure of Rézo-Ekolo for recognition by the government of Haiti as a legal association.

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

Component 1: Strengthening the Rézo-Ekolo

- The lack of legal recognition for the Rézo-Ekolo during almost the entire project has compromised the development of the network and its advocacy potential/ impact within the government and post-earthquake reconstruction policy formulation.

Component 2: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into reconstruction policy and processes

- Validation and ratification of the French and Creole versions of the *Key Biodiversity Areas of Haiti* by Rézo-Ekolo is still to happen, and dissemination of KBAs in print form has not been achieved yet. However, the document was distributed in digital form to the primary government ministries and donor institutions (e.g., USAID, GIZ, ACDI). With the production of the KBA document at the end of the project, there was little opportunity for these priority sites to be built into policy and other relevant processes (although see description of project achievements above).

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

- *Key Biodiversity Areas of Haiti* document in three languages
- Rézo-Ekolo strategic plan and legal status documents.

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

The project was poorly designed insofar that an equal standing member of the Rézo-Ekolo (i.e., Société Audubon Haïti) was selected to lead the development and functioning of the network without benefit to itself. SAH became the *de facto* decision-maker and management unit when the coordinator of Rézo-Ekolo resigned. SAH was also expected to distribute funds to Rézo-Ekolo members as “grants” to satisfy individual members’ agendas without benefit to the Rézo-Ekolo as a whole (thus undermining the functioning of the network). From the beginning, the grant should have been administered directly by an institution in Haiti with experience in institution - building so that SAH would not have been burdened with such responsibility and could play its role as an equal standing member of the network. The administrative layers (CEPF, BirdLife, SAH, and Rézo-Ekolo) were not an effective use of grant funds and resulted in confused lines of communication and caused delays in decision-making, conflict resolution, and efficient project management. As an emergency grant targeting a country that was in turmoil politically, socially and in terms of infrastructure and capacity, the project should have been conceived as a smaller grant building in far greater flexibility to respond quickly to changing circumstances.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

The key successes of the project came late, during the extension period of February–April, 2012. These included the translation of the KBA document, the development of the strategic plan and the legal draft of the Rézo-Ekolo statutes as a Haitian association. These successes represent a stripped down set of outputs from the initial project design, in recognition of the complexity of working in post-earthquake Haiti and a flawed and perhaps naïve project design.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

It is possible to organize and develop a consortium (or association) of environmental organizations in a developing country such as Haiti. However, the approach and steps required to do this successfully need to be better designed and thought-out in relation to the major risk factors being considered. The post-earthquake period (post January 2010) was not the most favorable time due the emergency nature of the economic, social and political priorities of the country. As the country’s economic situation stabilizes, there will be greater opportunity for an

organization like Rézo-Ekolo to grow and become permanently established as an independent (autonomous) and fully-functional institution. This project has provided the foundation for that opportunity to be taken but has not succeeded in delivering the Rézo-Ekolo as a robust, dynamic institutional network.

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
N/A	N/A		

**Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:*

- A Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- C Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

The establishment of the Rezo-Ekolo as a formal, legally recognised network has been a success, and the members have worked together, with commitment to establish a strategic plan for the network. Their long-term commitment to continue to work together and work on the implementation of the strategic plan is as yet unknown and will be a challenge. However, the foundation has been put in place to give this network the best possible chance of realising its potential.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

NA

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: David Wege
Organization name: BirdLife International
Mailing address: Wellbrook Court, Girton Road, Cambridge, CB3 0NA, UK
Tel: +44 (0)1223 277318
Fax: +44 (0)1223 277200
Email: david.wege@birdlife.org

Name: Arnaud Dupuy
Organization name: Société Audubon Haïti
Mailing address: Campus Université Quisqueya, Jean Paul II, Haut Turgeau, Port-au-Prince, Haiti
Tel: (509)-2949-9000
Fax: N/A
E-mail: amdupuy@yahoo.com

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2011 to April 30, 2012. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	None			

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit													
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Total																					

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit: