

# ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

## INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs), previously called “Assessment of Development Results) (ADRs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national efforts for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.<sup>1</sup> The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of IEO is two-fold: (i) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (ii) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership. Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

This is the first ICPE for Haiti and will be conducted in 2020 towards the end of the current UNDP programme cycle of 2017-2021, with a view to contributing to the preparation of UNDP’s new programme starting from 2022. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Haiti, UNDP Haiti country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean.

## NATIONAL CONTEXT

Haiti is a country located on the island of Hispaniola in the Caribbean Sea. It occupies one third of the island which it shares with the Dominican Republic.

On January 2010, Haiti's capital, Port-au-Prince, was struck by an earthquake of magnitude 7. The earthquake killed an estimated 230,000 people and displaced 1.5 million. It resulted in damages and losses of US\$7.9 billion (120 percent of GDP) and in US\$11.3 billion in estimated reconstruction needs<sup>2</sup>. The disaster exacerbated Haiti’s many preexisting development challenges as well as most of its socioeconomic indicators. Compounding these challenges, cholera broke out in 2010, sickening 760,000 people and killing almost 9,000. Intensified control efforts—including an ambitious vaccination campaign—have resulted in a significant decline in cases, from more than 41,000 suspected cases and 440 deaths in 2016, to over 3,000 suspected cases and 37 deaths from January through August 2018<sup>3</sup>, and there have been no laboratory-confirmed cases since January 2019.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/evaluation-policy.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Country Partnership Framework (2015), World Bank

<sup>3</sup> Haiti’s Political and Economic Conditions (2020), Congressional research service

Haiti is the poorest country in the western hemisphere. Almost 60 percent of Haiti's population, 6.3 million people, remain poor, and 2.5 million, extremely poor. Poverty incidence is highest and deepest in rural areas<sup>4</sup> where 48.1 percent of the population lives<sup>5</sup>. Haiti's annual population growth remains high, at 1.3 percent<sup>6</sup>. Inequality in Haiti is also the highest in the Americas with a Gini indicator at 0.6<sup>7</sup>.

In 2019, Haiti ranked 169<sup>th</sup> out of 189 countries on Human Development Index (9.5 expected years of schooling and 2.4 percent of GDP expenditure in education, 63.7 life expectancy at birth with a GDP expenditure in health of 5.4 percent). The country is also severely affected by HIV (2.2 percent of adults between the ages of 15-49).

After a 5.3 percent contraction in GDP in 2010 due to the earthquake, Haiti experienced a growth rate averaging 2.8 percent, from 2011 to 2017, spurred in part by high levels of reconstruction aid and remittances. According to the IMF, the growth projection for 2020 is 1.7 percent<sup>8</sup>. Indeed, the situation has deteriorated in 2019. The political instability has hindered Haiti's economic development. The country has experienced rapid currency depreciation (close to 30 percent), high levels of inflation (close to 20 percent), and a contraction in GDP. The fiscal deficit narrowed compared to the previous year (projected at 2.9 percent) but it has been achieved through drastic cuts in capital investment and social programmes. Energy subsidies represent a large fiscal burden estimated at some 3.5 percent of GDP.<sup>9</sup>

The structure of production of the Haiti's economy is still dominated by agriculture (70 percent of working population and less than 25 percent of GDP). Youth unemployment is a destabilizing factor that affects 30 percent of people aged between 15-24 and that contribute to propagation of armed gangs and criminal networks.

Haiti made significant progress in improving governance prior to the 2010 earthquake, but recovery since then has been slow. Democratic institutions remain weak and stability fragile<sup>10</sup>. Over the past couple of years, public protests requested the government to do more to fight corruption. The Senate's Special Commission of Investigation released a report detailing alleged fraud by current and former Haitian officials in loans from Venezuela's PetroCaribe discounted oil programme. The report was received with street protests against corruption. According to the corruption perception index<sup>11</sup>, Haiti ranks 161 of 180 countries.

Excellency M. Jovenel Moïse was inaugurated as president on February 7, 2017, marking a return to constitutional order after having been without an elected president from February 2016 to February 2017. In September 2017, the president's budget for 2018 was approved, which included several tax increases. The public greeted these tax increases with violent street protests. In 2018, decision to end oil subsidies also sparked massive protests and the worst political and social unrest the country has seen in years. Several other similar lockdown movements lasting several weeks and even months, calling for the resignation of President Jovenel Moïse, and more recently, schools were closed between September and December 2019. Population distrust in their government remains high with a participation in election below 25%, compared to 60% in 2006 election<sup>12</sup>. In October 2019 legislative elections were not held exacerbating political instability, and this in addition to the legislature's mandate expiring in January 2020.

---

<sup>4</sup> Poverty assessment (2015), World Bank

<sup>5</sup> Country Programme Document (2017), UNDP

<sup>6</sup> UNDP, *ibid*

<sup>7</sup> Human Development Index (2019), UNDP

<sup>8</sup> Haiti, country at a glance, IMF

<sup>9</sup> Haiti overview (2019), World Bank

<sup>10</sup> Haiti's Political and Economic Conditions (2020), Congressional research service

<sup>11</sup> Corruption perception index (2018), Transparency International

<sup>12</sup> Addendum au bilan commun de pays (2020), UN

As a result, President Moïse is now ruling by decree. Although attempts were made for a national dialogue between October and February, tension between the executive and legislative continued, and in early March 2020, President Moïse appointed a new government, led by Prime Minister Joseph Jouthe. The next presidential elections are due in 2021 and are expected to be volatile.<sup>13</sup>

Political instability and weak economic recovery facilitated the resurgence of gang violence leading to further instability in Haiti.<sup>14</sup> An aggravating factor is Haiti's geographical position. Haiti is a transit point for cocaine from South America and marijuana from Jamaica headed to U.S. and other markets.<sup>15</sup> According to the United Nations Mission for Justice Support in Haiti (MINUJUSTH), 159 gangs are active in Haiti in 2019. The general security situation has become unpredictable, and crime levels are high.<sup>16</sup> While the capacity of the Haitian National Police has improved in recent years (expanded from 3 000 in 2004 to 15 000 in 2018), the recent exchange of gunfire between protesting police officers and soldiers of the recently reinstated Haitian Armed Forces on February 23 could lead to a fragmentation of security forces and a further deterioration of the security situation.<sup>17</sup>

Haiti is one of the most exposed countries in the world to natural hazards and the country remains vulnerable. More than 96 percent of the population is exposed to hurricanes, floods and earthquakes. Recovery efforts continue more than three years after Hurricane Matthew (2016), which caused losses and damages estimated at 32 percent of 2015 GDP<sup>18</sup>. From 1994-2013, Haiti was considered the third most affected country by extreme weather events in terms of lives lost and economic damages<sup>19</sup>. Climate change is expected to exacerbate the risk of hazards by increasing the frequency and/or intensity of extreme events and thus further increasing Haiti's vulnerability. Climate change may also reduce agricultural productivity and pose a significant threat to food security (70 percent of the population is currently affected by food security<sup>20</sup> and 5.5 percent of the population is dependent of humanitarian aid<sup>21</sup>). Extensive use of wood fuels has caused massive deforestation and soil erosion (in 2012, 92.7 percent of the population used wood for cooking<sup>22</sup>), worsening the impacts of disasters related to climate change. Haiti is also facing a new challenge brought by the COVID-19 outbreak. Fifteen cases were confirmed within its borders at the end of March 2020. The Government announced a number of measures to slow the spread of COVID-19, including the implementation of a curfew, temporarily closing its border including commercial flights and closing schools, universities, and factories. Nevertheless, the weak health structure of the country makes it very challenging for the Government to respond to the COVID-19 crisis.

Though Haiti is close to achieving gender equality in primary and secondary education, women and girls have far much less access to justice, economic opportunity and maternal health. Evidence from the 2015 Poverty Assessment showed that women and girls in Haiti face significant obstacles when accumulating assets (women are 20 percent more likely to be unemployed, face greater economic insecurity and earn 32 percent less than men). Women also are more likely to be illiterate and register lower education and health outcomes. Only 4 percent of all parliamentary seats are occupied by women, placing Haiti 136th of

---

<sup>13</sup> Congressional research service, *ibid*

<sup>14</sup> World report (2019), Human Rights Watch

<sup>15</sup> Department of State's 2019 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report

<sup>16</sup> Safety and security (2019), gov.uk

<sup>17</sup> Haitian Police and Army Gunfire Exchange Indicates Potential Fragmentation of Security Forces, Raising Civil War Risks (2020), IHS Global Insight Daily Analysis

<sup>18</sup> World Bank, *ibid*

<sup>19</sup> Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery on Haiti,

<sup>20</sup> Country Program Document (2017), UNDP

<sup>21</sup> Addendum au bilan commun de pays (2020), UN

<sup>22</sup> UNDP, *ibid*

142 countries. In 2018, the country had a Gender Inequality Index of 0.620 and a gender development index of 0.890.

## UNDP PROGRAMME IN HAITI

The United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) was established in 2004 to restore security and stability, support the political process, strengthen government institutions and rule-of-law structures, and promote and protect human rights. In 2017, the UN Security Council, in its resolution 2350 decided that MINUSTAH would close on 15 October 2017, transitioning to a smaller follow up peacekeeping mission (United Nations Mission for Justice Support in Haiti – MINUJUSTH) which would support government efforts to strengthen rule of law institutions, further develop the Haitian National Police and engage in human rights monitoring, reporting and analysis. MINUJUSTH completed its mandate on 15 October 2019, putting an end to 15 consecutive years of peacekeeping operations in the country. The UN Security Council, in its resolution 2476 of 25 June 2019, established the United Nations Integrated Office in Haiti (BINUH), a special political mission working on strengthening political stability and good governance, advancing a peaceful and stable environment, including through supporting an inclusive inter-Haitian national dialogue, and protecting and promoting human rights. The activities of the mission are integrated with those of the 19 agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations Country Team.

The UNDP country programme in Haiti for the period 2017-2021 is aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Framework for Haiti (UNSDF) for the same period. The UNSDF 2017-2021 includes a total of 5 outcomes, with indicative resources amounted to around 1,085 million USD. The humanitarian response is considered a crosscutting theme integrated in key interventions of the 5 outcomes. UNDP is involved in all 5 outcomes but plays a lead role in 3: (i) democratic governance and rule of law; (ii) poverty reduction; and (iii) reducing vulnerability and strengthening resilience, with a total of 10 outputs. UNDP plans to partner with the UN mission to further its activities. It also plans to partner with several UN agencies and other organizations in different initiatives and interventions.

In the area of democratic governance and rule of law, UNDP plans to pursue three priority areas of work: (a) institutional strengthening of the public administration and local governance for fairer access throughout the country to basic services, livelihood opportunities and territorial development; (b) strengthening the rule of law and human rights through interventions on citizen security, justice, the national police, prison management, and access to justice and legal aid; and (c) increased citizen participation in more credible democratic processes, including support for the modernization of civil status. This is an area where UNDP plans to build on the progress in terms of stabilization through MINUSTAH. In 2016, UNDP launched a joint Rule of Law programme in Haiti with the participation of MINUSTAH, UNICEF and UN Women, aiming at pooling efforts and resources to support the area of rule of law (reducing community violence and increasing access to justice, especially for minors and women) in a context marked by the transition. Integration efforts are a major feature of UNDP's work in democratic governance and rule of law.

With regard to poverty reduction, UNDP plans to work in three areas: (a) inclusive growth (employment, support to small and medium-sized enterprises, development of value chains focusing on traditional Haitian products); (b) social inclusion (supporting the Ministry of Planning, the Haitian Statistics Institute

and the Observatory Unit on Poverty and Social Exclusion to better direct public policies towards the most vulnerable, with a focus on social protection); and (c) strengthening of the agricultural sector (institutional capacity building to transform the sector, including through initiatives for better access to small-scale irrigation).

In the area of reducing vulnerability and strengthening resilience, UNDP plans to work on environment and disaster risk reduction, promoting the mainstreaming of environmental considerations into strategies, policies and development programmes, placing emphasis on ecosystem resilience and services, pursuing advocacy and awareness/education on the challenges of conservation and responsible natural resources management, and strengthening national and local capacities to collect and use information on climate risk and disseminate hydro-meteorological and environmental warnings, including the development of a system for monitoring progress and analyzing risks, and the establishment of a national database on disaster-related loss and damage.

The UNSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in, UNDP programme outputs and indicative resources are summarized in the following table:

<b>Table 1: UNSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in, UNDP programme outputs and indicative resources (2017-2021)</b>			
<b>UNSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in and UNDP country programme outputs</b>		<b>Indicative resources (US\$ thousands)</b>	
		<b>Regular resources</b>	<b>Other resources</b>
Outcome 1: The public institutions and civil society improve the rule of law and decentralization for good governance at all decision-making levels	Output 1: The capacities of State legal institutions are reinforced, allowing women and men to enjoy greater access to formal justice and a safe environment Output 2: The functions, financing and capacities of subnational institutions are strengthened in order to provide basic services and respond to the population’s needs Output 3: Subnational development plans are gender-sensitive and in line with the Sustainable Development Goals Output 4: Mechanisms, instruments and spaces of communication, dialogue and interaction between the State and citizens to increase citizen control are in place and operational	4,100	22,300
<b>Total outcome 1</b>		<b>26,400</b>	



Outcome 2: The population, particularly the most vulnerable, have equitable access to livelihoods, decent “green” jobs and productive resources to reduce poverty in all of its forms, within a favorable and inclusive socio-economic and cultural environment	Output 1: The available options for inclusive and sustainable social protection are operational and supported Output 2: Women and youth benefited from facilitated access to economic opportunities, including in the formal job market Output 3: National and territorial agricultural institutions are operational in order to carry out in-depth transformation of agricultural production methods, which would be both sustainable and employment- and income-generating	7,300	99,400
<b>Total outcome 2</b>		<b>106,700</b>	
Outcome 3: National, regional and local institutions and civil society improve the management of rural and urban areas, agriculture and the environment, and mechanisms for preventing and reducing risks in order to improve the resilience of the population to natural disasters and to climate change	Output 1: National actors have the knowledge, capacities and necessary tools to improve natural resources management and risk reduction and management Output 2: Mechanisms and partnerships are set up to promote sustainable models of production, distribution and consumption Output 3: The capacities of public administrations to enforce the application of environmental norms and good practices are strengthened	5,842	62,200
<b>Total outcome 3</b>		<b>68,042</b>	
<b>Grand total</b>		<b>201,142</b>	

Source: UNDP Haiti Country Programme Document 2017-2021

## SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme in order to feed into the process of developing the new country programme. The ICPE will focus on the present programme cycle (2017-2021) while taking into account interventions which may have started in the previous programme cycle (2013 - 2016) but continued for a few more years into the current programme cycle.

As a country-level evaluation of UNDP, the ICPE will focus on the formal UNDP country programme approved by the Executive Board but will also consider any changes from the initial CPD during the period under review. The ICPE covers interventions funded by all sources of finance, core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds, etc. It is important to note that a UNDP country office may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these “non-project” activities may be crucial for advancing the political and social agenda of a country. The ICPE will also capture UNDP’s integration efforts and collaboration with the UN missions (MINUSTAH, MINUJUSTH, BINUH).

Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of UNV and UNCDF through undertaking joint work with UNDP. This information will be used for synthesis in order to provide corporate level evaluative evidence of performance of the associated fund and programme.

## METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.<sup>23</sup> The ICPE will address the following three main evaluation questions.<sup>24</sup> These questions will also guide the presentation of the evaluation findings in the report.

1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?

To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate, to better understand how and under what conditions UNDP's interventions are expected to lead to democratic governance, poverty reduction and strengthened resilience in the country. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme's desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes.

As part of this analysis, the progression of the programme over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD's progression, UNDP's capacity to adapt to the changing governance, economic and humanitarian context in Haiti (including the political crisis since July 2018, the deteriorating security situation and economic situation due to political and institutional instability, the transition from MINUSTAH to MINUJUSTH and BINUH, and UNDP's collaboration with these missions, etc.) and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at.

The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analyzed in response to evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved results and the extent to which these results have contributed to the intended CPD objectives and responded to the Government's priorities. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect as well as unintended results will be identified.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that influenced - positively or negatively - UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results in the country will be examined in response to evaluation question 3. In addition to country-specific factors that may explain UNDP's performance, the utilization of resources to deliver results (including managerial practices), the extent to which the CO fostered partnerships and synergies with other actors (including through south-south and triangular cooperation), and the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment in design and implementation of the CPD are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.

---

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>

<sup>24</sup> The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria. More detailed sub-questions will be developed during the desk review phase of the evaluation.

## DATA COLLECTION

**Assessment of existing data and data collection constraints.** An assessment was carried out for each outcome area to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints, to determine the data collection needs and methods. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available. The assessment indicated that there were seven decentralized evaluations undertaken during the period from 2017 to present, which were all project evaluations. Six of the decentralized evaluations were quality-assessed by IEO: one report was rated as satisfactory (rating of 5), three reports were rated as moderately satisfactory (rating of 4), one report was rated as moderately unsatisfactory (rating of 3) and one report was rated as unsatisfactory (rating of 2). Where the quality was acceptable, the evaluations will serve as inputs into the ICPE. The majority of projects have project documents, and some annual progress reports are available. Overall, the programme has sufficient information to conduct the ICPE.

With respect to indicators, the CPD list 10 indicators for the 3 outcome results, and 27 indicators to measure the 10 outputs, with baseline and targets. To the extent possible, the ICPE will seek to use these indicators to better understand the intention of the UNDP programme and to measure or assess progress towards the outcomes. The indicators mostly indicated national statistics, and reports of various ministries as data sources, and the evaluation's ability to measure progress against these indicators will therefore depend on national statistical capacities, including the periodicity of the national data system and the availability of disaggregated data by age, sex, geographic area, etc.

It is also important to note that UNDP projects that contributed to different outcomes are at different stages of implementation, and therefore it may not always be possible to determine the projects' contribution to results. In cases where the projects/initiatives are still in their initial stages, the evaluation will document observable progress and seek to ascertain the possibility of achieving the outcome given the programme design and measures already put in place.

Regarding field work, due to the volatile security situation of the country (currently the security level of the capital Port-au-Prince is defined as level 3 (moderate) by UNDSS), there might be some restrictions on the evaluation team's ability to travel in the city and in different parts of the country. The evaluation team will work closely with the CO and consult UNDSS in determining the necessary security measures and the sites for field visits.

**Data collection methods:** The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of documentation and information and interviews with key informants, including beneficiaries, partners and managers. An advance questionnaire will be administered to the country office before the data collection mission in the country. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus group discussions will be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

The evaluation team will also undertake field visits to selected project sites to observe the projects first-hand. It is expected that regions where UNDP has a concentration of field projects (in more than one outcome area), as well as those where critical projects are being implemented will be considered. There should be a coverage of all outcome areas. The coverage should include a sample, as relevant, of both successful projects and projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned, both larger and smaller pilot projects, as well as both completed and active projects.



The IEO and the country office have identified an initial list of background and programme-related documents which is posted on an ICPE SharePoint website. The following secondary data will be reviewed, among others: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports; and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners.

In line with UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all of UNDP Haiti programmes and operations. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

**Validation.** The evaluation will use triangulation of information collected from different sources and/or by different methods to enhance the validity of findings.

**Stakeholder involvement:** A participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with multiple stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the initial phase a stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, and to examine any potential partnerships that could further improve UNDP's contribution to the country.

## MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

**Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP:** The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Haiti Country Office, the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Government of Haiti. The IEO Lead Evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

**UNDP Country Office in Haiti:** The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders and ensure that all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country is available to the team, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team in-kind organizational support (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries; assistance for project site visits). To ensure the independence of the views expressed, country office staff will not participate in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes. The country office will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a videoconference with the IEO, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the country office will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

**UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC):** RBLAC will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

**Evaluation Team:** The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. The IEO will ensure gender balance and take into account the country's working language (French) in the team which will include the following members:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for managing the ICPE, including preparing for and designing the evaluation (i.e. the present ToR) as well as selecting the evaluation team and providing methodological guidance. The LE will be responsible for the synthesis process and the preparation of the draft and final evaluation reports. The LE will be backstopped by another evaluator also from the IEO.
- **Associate Evaluator (AE):** The AE will support the LE in the preparation and design of the evaluation, including background research and documentation, the selection of the evaluation team, and the synthesis process. The AE will review the draft report and support the LE in other aspects of the ICPE process as may be required.
- **Consultants:** 3 consultants (international and national) will be recruited and will be responsible for the outcome areas. Under the guidance of LE, they will conduct preliminary research and data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE report.

The roles of the different members of the evaluation team can be summarized in Table 2.

<b>Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome areas</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Report</b>	<b>Data collection</b>
Democratic governance and rule of law (outcome 1)	Consultant/LE	Consultant/LE
Poverty reduction (outcome 2)	Consultant/ALE	Consultant/ALE
Reducing vulnerability and strengthening resilience (outcome 3)	Consultant/LE/ALE	Consultant/LE/ALE
General strategic and management issues	LE/ALE	LE/AE/consultant


## **EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute the framework for conducting the evaluation.

**Phase 1: Preparatory work.** The IEO prepares the ToR and the evaluation design, including an overall evaluation matrix. Once the TOR is approved, additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals will be recruited. The IEO starts collecting data and documentation internally first and then filling data gaps with help from the UNDP country office.

**Phase 2: Desk analysis.** Evaluation team members will conduct desk review of reference material, and identify specific evaluation questions, and issues. Further in-depth data collection will be conducted, by administering an advance questionnaire and interviews (via phone, Skype, etc.) with key stakeholders, including country office staff. Based on this, detailed evaluation questions, gaps and issues that require validation during the field-based phase of the data collection will be identified.

**Phase 3: Field-based data collection.** During this phase, the evaluation team undertakes a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission is around 2-2.5 weeks. The evaluation team will liaise with CO staff and management, key government stakeholders and other



partners and beneficiaries. At the beginning of the field mission, the evaluation team will hold a kick-off meeting at the CO to introduce the evaluation, its objectives and process to ensure good understanding and involvement. At the end of the mission, the evaluation team will hold a debrief presentation of the key preliminary findings at the CO. Efforts have been made to coordinate the timing of the evaluation mission with the audit mission by the Office of Audit and Investigation, planned to take place in the period of 22 June – 4 July 2020. Overlapping the evaluation and the audit missions to have some joint meetings in the country will facilitate sharing of information, minimizing any duplication in data collection efforts between IEO, OAI and the CO itself, thus enhancing the efficiency of both exercises.

**Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief.** Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The draft will first be subject to peer review by IEO and its Evaluation Advisory Panel. Once the draft is quality cleared, it will be circulated to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any necessary additional corrections will be made and the UNDP Haiti country office will prepare the management response to the ICPE, under the overall oversight of the regional bureau.

The report will then be shared at a final debriefing where the results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders. The way forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders with respect to the recommendations as well as to strengthening accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the evaluation report will be finalized and published.

**Phase 5: Publication and dissemination.** The ICPE report will be written in English. It will follow the standard IEO publication guidelines. For better engagement of the national partners in the process and better utilization of the final report at the national level, arrangements will be made for the translation of the report into French as needed. The ICPE report will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board by the time of approving a new Country Programme Document. It will be widely distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Haiti country office and the Government of Haiti will disseminate to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website<sup>25</sup> as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> [web.undp.org/evaluation](http://web.undp.org/evaluation)

<sup>26</sup> [erc.undp.org](http://erc.undp.org)

## TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively<sup>27</sup> as follows in Table 3:

<b>Table 3: Tentative timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in September 2021</b>		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
<b>Phase 1: Preparatory work</b>		
TOR completed and approved by IEO Director	LE	March 2020
Selection of consultant team members	LE	April 2020
Notification and Identification of the institutions & partners to be met	LE/CO	April/May
<b>Phase 2: Desk analysis</b>		
Preliminary desk review of reference material	Evaluation team	March-April 2020
Advance questionnaires to the CO	LE/AE/CO	April 2020
<b>Phase 3: Field-based data collection</b>		
Mission to Haiti	LE/AE/Consultants	22 June – 4 July 2020
<b>Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief</b>		
Analysis of data and submission of background papers	Consultants	July – August 2020
Synthesis and report writing	LE/AE	August-September 2020
Zero draft for internal IOE clearance/EAP comments	LE	October 2020
First draft to CO/RBLAC for comments	LE/CO/RBLAC	End October 2020
Second draft shared with the government, key donors and national stakeholders	LE/CO/GOV	End November 2020
Draft management response	CO	November-December 2020
Stakeholder workshop via videoconference	IEO/CO/RBLAC	December 2020
<b>Phase 5: Publication and dissemination</b>		
Editing and formatting	IEO	January 2021
Final report and evaluation brief	IEO	January 2021
Dissemination of the final report	IEO	February 2021

<sup>27</sup> The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.