

An abstract graphic at the top of the page consisting of a dark blue background with a network of thin white lines and small colored dots (yellow, blue, orange) connected by lines, resembling a data network or a stylized city skyline.

# **Independent Country Programme Evaluation:**

## **Haiti**

### *Annexes*



## Contents

<b>ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ANNEX 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>ANNEX 3. PEOPLE CONSULTED .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>ANNEX 5. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME AND OUTPUT INDICATORS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>ANNEX 6. PROJECT LIST .....</b>	<b>39</b>

# 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	4,100	22,300
	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		
<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.

## ANNEX 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Evaluation Questions	Sub-questions	Data/Info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)	Data analysis (e.g.)
<b>EQ 1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?</b>	1.1 What are UNDP's outcomes as defined in the CPD?	<p>UNDP's specific areas of work and approaches for contribution under CPD/UNDAF outcomes.</p> <p>UNDP's interventions strategy, e.g. theory of change that maps an expected pathway of change, logic and assumptions, including plans detailing required financial resources and capacity for programme implementation (and evidence of their provision).</p> <p>Evidence of design tailored to meeting development challenges and emerging needs of the country.</p> <p>Evidence of design based on a clear and comprehensive risks analysis.</p>	<p>Desk/literature review of relevant documents (including problem analysis conducted by the CO)</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews/group discussions with relevant stakeholders conducted remotely</p> <p>CO Questionnaire Survey</p>	<p>Map a theory of change to identify the logic, sequence of events and assumptions behind the proposed programme</p> <p>Problem/risk analysis of underlying development challenges</p> <p>Stakeholders analysis</p> <p>SMART analysis of CPD indicators</p> <p>Triangulate data collected from various sources and means (e.g. cross check interview data with desk review to validate or refute TOC).</p>
	1.2 If there have been any changes to the programme design and implementation from the initial CPD, what were they, and why were the changes made?	Evidence of existence and application of relevant measures to respond to the changes put and their coordination/consistency across the implemented activities.		
<b>EQ 2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended</b>	2.1 To what extent and with which results did UNDP achieve its specific objectives (CP outputs) as defined	Progress towards achievement of intended objectives per sector (including a list of indicators chosen for the CPD and those used for corporate reporting, baselines, targets; and status)	<p>Desk/literature review of relevant documents</p> <p>Assessment of ROARs, GRES as well as indicators status to assess progress and trends</p>	<p>Contribution analysis against TOC assumptions</p> <p>Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP</p>

<b>objectives?</b>	in the CPD and other strategies (if different)?	Evidence of achievement of results within the governance - poverty-environment/energy-climate nexus	Project QA data extraction	Analysis of evaluations and audits;
	2.2 To what extent did the achieved results contribute to the outcome?	Clear linkages between UNDP's specific interventions and UNDAF-defined outcome level changes Evidence of contribution to GEWE Evidence of contributions to the SDGs	Semi-structured interviews/group discussions with relevant stakeholders conducted remotely  CO Questionnaire Survey	Summary of outcome indicators and status  Analysis of corporate surveys  Trend analysis of ROARs & GRES
	2.3 Were there positive or negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes?	Evidence of positive or negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes derived from UNDP's interventions	Project implementation reports	Triangulate data collected from various sources and means.
<b>EQ 3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?</b>	3.1 What programme design and implementation-related factors have contributed to or hindered results?	Key factors affecting the results (Typology of key factors to be created, e.g.): • Degree of alignment with national priorities • Programme focus/design and implementation approach (e.g. mix of interventions, up/downstream, short/long-term, appropriateness of indicators)	Project QA data extraction  Semi-structured interviews/group discussions with relevant stakeholders (conducted remotely)- focus on validating or refuting lines of inquiry and collecting perceptions and observations on the "why" and factors that influence or impede effectiveness. Tabulation of corporate surveys data CO Questionnaire Survey	Completion of a template of 'factors' with analysis of 'strength of influence (extent the factors affect UNDP's ability to achieve its objectives)' Contribution analysis against TOC assumptions; Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP Analysis of evaluations and audits; Analysis of corporate surveys Trend analysis of ROARs & GRES Cross-check interview data with desk review to validate or refute lines of inquiry – highlighting data on the "why" and factors that influence or impede effectiveness; (check for unintended outcomes);
	3.2 How have the key principles of the Strategic Plan been applied to the country programme design <sup>28</sup>	• Business environment to promote GEWE • Use of partnerships (incl. UNV/UNCDF, PUNS, IFI, CSO, Private sector, think tanks) • Innovation and knowledge management • Use of SSC to enhance results • Measures to ensure efficient use of resources • M&E capacity		

<sup>28</sup> As the CPDs under review may be based on the previous Strategic Plan (2014-2017), we should select a set of key principles reflected in both old and new Strategic Plan for our purpose, to examine how they have been reflected in programme design and used to enhance the results). For example, in the new Strategic Plan 2018-2021, the key issues include: (1) 'Working in partnership': i) Within UN System; and ii) Outside UNS (South-South; civil society; private sector; and IFIs); (2) 'Helping to achieve the 2030 Agenda'; (3) '6 Signature Solutions': i) Keeping people out of poverty; ii) Strengthen effective, accountable, inclusive governance; iii) enhance prevention and recovery for resilient society; iv) promote nature-based solutions for sustainable plant; v) close the energy gap; and vi) strengthen gender equality; (4) 'Improved business models (Performance; and Innovation)



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Social &amp; Environment Standards’ (incl human rights, environment sustainability)</li> <li>• Project delivery modality (NIM/DIM)</li> </ul>		Triangulate data from desk review and interviews with survey to close gaps and findings
	3.3 What mechanisms were put in place at the design and implementation stage to ensure the sustainability of results, given the identifiable risks?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of capacity of partner institutions/organisations/beneficiaries</li> <li>• Supported government policies and mechanisms encourage continuation</li> <li>• Government mechanisms and budgets in place for managing, operating and maintaining set of supported institutional measures</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate sustainable results at project level with typology of “lessons learnt” and “best practices”</li> <li>• Evidence of further funding and implementation of activities following up on results achieved with support of UNDP</li> </ul>		

## ANNEX 3. PEOPLE CONSULTED

### Government of Haiti

ALTIDOR Nicole, Ministre MAST, Ministère des Affaires Sociales et du Travail (MAST)

ALY Jean Roudy, Office de Management des Ressources Humaines

ASTREL Joseph, Directeur Général MDE, Ministère de l'Environnement (MDE)

AUGUSTE Amoce, Directeur Général OPC, Office de Protection du Citoyen

BERNADEL Audain Fils, Ministre du MICT, Ministère de l'Intérieur et des Collectivités Territoriales

BRANLY Eugène, Directeur Général Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Ressources naturelles et du Développement Rural (MARNDR)

CAZEAU Harmel, Directeur de la CNSA, Coordination Nationale de la Sécurité Alimentaire (CNSA)

CELESTIN Jean, Directeur de la Direction des projets sociaux, Fonds d'Assistance Économique et Sociale (FAES)

COFFY Jonas, Ministre du MCI, Ministère du Commerce et d'Industrie

CONSTANT Jean Robert, Secrétaire Technique, CSPJ

COUDO Prénor, Agence Nationale des Aires Protégées (ANAP)

DELICES Max, Directeur Exécutif, Conseil Électoral Provisoire

Elie JEAN PHILIPPE, Office de Management des Ressources Humaines

EUGENE Gerald, Office de Management des Ressources Humaines

FRITZNER Joseph, Ministre du MAST, MAST

GUERRO Plancher Louis, Direction Administrative et Pénitentiaire, Ministère de la justice et de la sécurité pénitentiaire (MJSP)

Guy SERGE, Institut Haïtien des Statistiques et d'Informatique

HERIVEAUX Rudy, Directeur Général MAST, Ministère des Affaires Sociales et du Travail (MAST)

HERTELOU Jean Pierre, Officier de programme FAES, Coordinateur

James CADET, Directeur Changements climatiques MDE, Ministère de l'Environnement (MDE)

JEANTEL Joseph, Directeur Général ANAP, Agence Nationale des Aires Protégées (ANAP)

LAJOIE Eudes, Directeur Général, Service Nationale de Gestion des Résidus Solides (SNGRS)

LAMARCHE Philippe, JSSP

LOUIS Raymond Jacques, Directeur Général Ministère de la justice et de la sécurité pénitentiaire (MJSP)

MAGLOIRE René, CNAL, Ministère de la justice et de la sécurité pénitentiaire (MJSP)

MARSEILLE Jean Cyrus, Office de Management des Ressources Humaines

MERJUSTE Give Laure, Office de Management des Ressources Humaines

MOMPREMIER Marie Giselhaine, Ministre du MCFDF Ministère à la condition féminine et aux droits des femmes (MCFDF)

MOMPREVIL Saint Juste, Conseiller CSCCA, Cour supérieure des comptes et du contentieux administratif (CCSCCA)

ORIOU Michèle, Comité Interministériel d'Aménagement du Territoire

PAUL Reginald, Chef de Cabinet du MPCE, Ministère de la Planification et de la Coopération Externe

PIARD Boby Emmanuel, Directeur Général MPCE / CNIGS, MPCE / CNIGS

RICOT Pierre Rodney, Directeur Unité d'étude et de programmation MAST, Ministère des Affaires Sociales et du Travail (MAST)

SANON Wislene, Ministère du Commerce et d'Industrie

SEJOUR Rodriguez, Directeur de Cabinet, Service Nationale de Gestion des Résidus Solides (SNGRS)

SYLVESTRE Rene, Président de la Cour de Cassation et du CSPJ, CSPJ

TANIRA Gay Marie, Service Nationale de Gestion des Résidus Solides (SNGRS)

THOMAS Wisner, Office de Management des Ressources Humaines

Wilson FIEVRE, Directeur Général, Institut Haïtien des Statistiques et d'Informatique

ZAKARI Mahamadou Bassirou Hassan, IGPNH

## **UNDP**

ALCIDE Marie Antolaine, Operations Manager

ALEXANDRE Jean Ronald, Chef Projet

ALEXIS Ardrouin

BANGOURA Sekou, Finance Specialist

BENJAMIN Guerda, Gender Focal Point

BLAIN Marie Kathleen, Chargé de Projet

BONIFAY Claudia, Point focal Etat de Droit / Accès Justice

BOUBAKRI Amor, Point focal Elections

CALIXTE Mulinca, M&E Officer

CARRIER Adeline, Programme Specialist

CEUS Stendelet

CUPIDON Marc Joanis, Chargé de Projet

FENELON Leopold, Programme Analyst

FRANCOIS Marie Pascale, Programme Specialist

GEORGES Yvivo, Chef Projet

GERMAIN Guims, Chef Projet

HIDALGO Olivier, Expert gouvernance locale, point focal frontière, jeunesse, UNDP HQ RBLAC

JEAN-MICHEL Durosca, Chef Projet

JEANTY Hervens, Chef Projet

JN PAUL Dorine, Programme Specialist

JOSEPH Jacques-Washington, Chef Projet

JUVIGNY Jacques, Point focal projet DDR/CVR

LACONI Jessica

LAVENTURE Patrice, Expert Technique

LOUIS Obnerson, Chef Projet

MERARD Othniel

NEUVIEME Gerald

PREVINA Kerlande Eliacin

SCIARRA Rita

SOLON Moliere, Communication focal point

TERMILUS Wilner, Chef Projet

VOLTAIRE Renaud

ZIEBELL Stephanie, DRR

### **Other UN agencies**

AGUERO Alejandro, UNICEF

ALVAREZ Pilar, Représentante Résidente, UNESCO

AMBROISE Stephanie, UN Women

BOSCO Valerio, BINUH - Justice, Affaires Politiques, BINUH

CLARK Jeffrey, UNESCO

CONSTIL Wilfrid, UNOPS

DE TORCY Raoul, Deputy Representative UNICEF, UNICEF

DeOLIVIERA Walter, Représentant adjoint FAO, FAO

DIOMANDE Moussa, BINUH Correction

EKOUE Dede, Country Representative UN Women, UN Women

ETIENNE Marjorie, Assistante Représentant Résident, UNFPA

FILS Snkwenkeu, UNICEF  
KRSMANOVIC Milos, DDR/CVR, BINUH  
LA LIME Helen, SRSG BINUH, BINUH  
LECLERCQ Fabrice, Représentant du Bureau International du Travail (BIT) en Haïti, BIT  
LOPRETE Giuseppe, Chef de mission -OIM, OIM  
LOUIS CHARLES Sadrax, UN Women  
LYNCH Marie, BINUH  
MELLON-VALLÈS Nyrlande, Assistante Représentante Résidente, UNESCO  
MELTON Jennifer, UNICEF  
MONCOEUR Alian, National programme Officer FIDA, IFAD  
MONFORT Darline, UNV Coordinator Haiti, UNV  
MONTEILS Fabien, PNUE  
MUNEVAR Felipe, UNOPS  
MUPHTAH Elmehdi AG, UNESCO  
NICOLAS Patrick, FAO  
POULARD Lisemene Ketty, OIM  
SASSENATH Yves, Représentant Résident, UNFPA  
TALBI Hanan, BINUH/droit de l'homme, BINUH  
TONDREAU Jean Luc, UNESCO

### **Donors and bilateral partners**

BEAU BLANC Magdala, USAID  
COTÉ Alexandre, Chef de la Coopération Canada, Canada  
DORLEON Nicolas, Coopération Japonaise, Japan  
DUPUY Regine, USAID  
EDA AUGMA Augustin Maud-Fana, Suisse  
GERMAIN Juline, European Union  
GILLES Daniella, Canada  
GILMORE Olivia, USAID  
GUILLEMOIS Murielle, European Union  
INOUE Taisei, Japan  
LEBELON Eddy, USAID

MAJERNIK Juli, USAID

PORETTI Fabrizio, Ambassade de Suisse, Suisse

PRASAD Shally, USAID

REVOLUS Georges Jasme, USAID

RODRIGUEZ-RUIZ Aniceto, Chef de la Coopération de l'Union Européenne, European Union

SAINT-CYR Camilien, USAID

SAVAGE Stuart, Coopération Canada, Canada

SIPP Caroline, Ancienne Cheffe des opérations BID, BID

TAYLOR David, USAID - Disaster Response and Assistance, USAID

**Civil society, Private sector, Academia, Programme beneficiaries**

ALONCE Pierre, CCPC Les Irois, Beneficiaire

BARRIENTOS Natalia Corro, Croix Rouge Francaise

BIEN-AIMÉ Paul-Antoine, Professeur, Université d'État d'Haiti

BILLY Gontran, Représentant, FENAMH (Fédération Nationale des Maires d'Haïti)

BOISSON Dominique, Professeur, Université d'État d'Haiti

BRANCHEREAU Amelie, Croix Rouge Francaise

BRAUM Pedro, Viva Rio

BRUNETTI Chiara, Gestion intégrée des marchés, Beneficiaire

CANTAVE Pascale, Représentante, FENAFEMH (Fédération Nationale des Femmes Maires d'Haïti)

CERNEUS Bertrand, Coordonnateur CROSE, Beneficiaire

CHANCY Elcia, Jeunes ODD, Beneficiaire

CLAUDE Enrico, Brigadier, Beneficiaire

CLEDANOR Montisino, CTD, Département de la Grande Anse, Coordination CCPC Grande Anse

CLERVEAU Gepson, Jeunes ODD, Beneficiaire

CRAAN Bernard, Président de la Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie d'Haïti (CCIH), Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie d'Haiti

DESCARDES Arnoux, Volontariat pour le développement d'Haiti

DESSIPE Venadia, Jeunes ODD, Beneficiaire

DIEUNIE Edouard, Plate-forme communautaire et bénéficiaire projet femmes entrepreneures a Pétionville, Beneficiaire

EDMIDE Joseph Guenin, FACSDIS Femme en Action Contre la Stigmatisation el la Discrimination Sexuelle

FEDNEL Joseph, Plateforme Pétion-ville

FOTSO Appolinaire, Chef de mission, ASF (Avocat Sans Frontière)

GUERLINE Thermilus, Membre Plateforme Canapé-vert, Beneficiaire

JEAN-PHILIPPE Rancon , Directeur adjoint, BGRM Geoscience for a sustainable Earth

JEANTY Yolette, Kay Fanm

JOSEPH Gueurson, Coordonnateur de OJADGA, Beneficiaire

LAROSE Vanessa, Bénéficiaire projet Femmes entrepreneurs, Beneficiaire

LOVE-Kendy, Coordonnateur, Association des Jeunes de la Ville de Jérémie

MAGLOIRE Daniele, Collectif contre l'impunité

MARIE DOMINIQUE Jeannot, Plate-forme communautaire et bénéficiaire projet femmes entrepreneurs a Pétion-ville, Beneficiaire

MARS Louis-Henri, Lakou Lape

MEUS Stephenson, Coordonnateur KOURAJ, LGBTI Community groups

MICHEL Paulemont, Coordonnateur de CODGA, Beneficiaire

MULTY Margareth, Brigadier, Beneficiary

NICOLAS Fidèle, CTD, Département des Nippes, Coordination CCPC Nippes

ODDIN Constant, Bénéficiaires projet Cholera, Beneficiaire

OLGUINE Dena, Plate-forme communautaire et bénéficiaire projet femmes entrepreneurs a Pétion-ville, Beneficiaire

PÉTILLON Gael, ASF (Avocat Sans Frontière)

PETIT FRÈRE Rosemila, Représentante, FENAFEMH (Fédération Nationale des Femmes Maires d'Haïti

PHILIPPEAUX Marie Yolaine, Représentante, FENAFEMH (Fédération Nationale des Femmes Maires d'Haïti

PIERRE Jude Édouard, Représentant, FENAMH (Fédération Nationale des Maires d'Haïti)

PIERRE-LOUIS Michele, FOKAL Fondation Connaissance et Liberté

POMPILUS Jean Joseph, CCPC Corail, Beneficiary

PROPHENE Jeudy, Coordonnateur MPPB, Beneficiary

RODRIGUEZ Megan, INL


Rose Midrène Francois, Membre Plateforme Communautaire de Jérémie, Beneficiaire

SAINTE ANNE Germain, Bénéficiaire projet Femmes entrepreneurs á Canapé-vert, Beneficiaire

TAPINASSI Silvia, Croix Rouge Francaise

TERRIER Monique, BGRM Geoscience for a sustainable Earth

THILL Magaly, Beneficiary



VEERABADREN Sendy, Croix Rouge Francaise

WESLY Saintilaire, Secrétaire Plateforme communautaire et bénéficiaire projet Femmes entrepreneurs,  
Beneficiaire

WILCKENSON Alexis, Bénéficiaire composante jeunes, Beneficiaire

WILNA Desir, Bénéficiaires Projet Cholera, Beneficiaire

ZOULA Patricia-Emmanuelle, BGRM Geoscience for a sustainable Earth



## ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

In addition to the documents named below, the evaluation team reviewed project documents, annual project reports, midterm review reports, final evaluation reports and other project documents. The evaluation team also consulted many websites, including of the government of Haiti and its partners and international development agencies.

Alinovi, L., D’Errico, M., Mane, E. & Romano, D., 2010, Livelihoods Strategies and Household Resilience to Food Insecurity: An Empirical Analysis to Kenya.

ATH, 2020, Mesures de mitigation par rapport au « Pays lock et du Coronavirus

Banque Mondiale et ONPES/MPCE, 2014, Haïti, Investir dans l’humain pour combattre la pauvreté, Banque Mondiale.

Banque Mondiale, 2020, Haiti/overview/Dernière mise à jour: 11 mai 2020.

Barrett, C.B & Constan, M.A., 2014, Toward a theory of resilience for international development applications.

Béné, C., Wood, R.G., Andrew Newsham, A. & Davies, M., 2012, Resilience: New Utopia or New Tyranny? Reflection about the Potentials and Limits of the Concept of Resilience in Relation to Vulnerability Reduction Programmes. IDS Working Paper Volume 2012 Number 405; CSP Working Paper Number 006.

BRH. Presentation-G1-Sommet de la finance.

Clervila, E., Batthazard-Accoua, K. et Dorvala, F.A., 2018, Le rôle de l’évaluation environnementale stratégique dans la gestion de la vulnérabilité en Haïti. Haïti Perspectives, vol. 6, no 3, Été 2018.

Centre d’Études et de Recherche en Management et en Économie (CERME), 2019, Rapport d’Étude Vulnérabilité des zones exposées à la violence communautaire (Port-au-Prince et Bas Artibonite)

Comité de pré-positionnement pour la gestion d’éventuelles catastrophes sismiques dans le Nord, 2017, Rapport sur l’état des lieux du risque dans le Grand Nord et les recommandations en matière de mitigation (Résumé).

Comité Interministériel d’Aménagement du territoire, 2016, Atlas des menaces naturelles en Haïti. Réalisé par le Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières (BRGM, France) en coordination avec le Comité Interministériel d’Aménagement du Territoire (CIAT) sur financement de la BM et de la GFDRR.

Confédération Suisse, 2018, Stratégie de coopération suisse en Haïti 2018 – 2021

Cutter, S. L., Burton, C.G., & Emrich, C.T., 2010, “Disaster Resilience Indicators for Benchmarking Baseline Conditions.” Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management 7: 1.

Cutter, S.L., 1996, «Societal Vulnerability to Environmental Hazards », Progress in Human Geography 20(4):529-539.

Décret portant sur la gestion de l’environnement et de régulation de la conduite des citoyens et citoyennes pour un développement durable : <https://www.ecolex.org/fr/details/legislation/decret-portant-sur-la-gestion-de-l'environnement-et-de-regulation-de-la-conduite-des-citoyens-et-citoyennes-pour-un-developpement-durable-lex-faoc065901/>.

Direction de la Protection Civile, Système National de Gestion des risques et désastres, 2017, Country Document for Disaster Risk Reduction. Document Pays, Haïti 2016-2020.

Guelson, J.-L., 2018, L'urbanisation anarchique, un problème majeur du développement en Haïti, 13 Avril 2018.

HCDH, 2018, Rapport du Haut-Commissaire des Nations Unies aux droits de l'homme 2018

<https://www.ht.undp.org/content/haïti/fr/home/sustainable-development.html>

IMF, 2020, Country Report No. 20/123

IPCC, 2012, «Glossary of terms», In C. B. Field et coll. (Eds), Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), Cambridge, R.-U.; New York; Cambridge University Press, p. 555-564.

Jeudy, D., 2013, Analyse des Lois Haïtiennes en relation avec la biodiversité avec emphase sur les ressources naturelles et les aires protégées.

Kyriakarakos, G., Balafoutis, A.T., & Bochtis, D., 2020, Proposing a Paradigm Shift in Rural Electrification Investments in Sub-Saharan Africa through Agriculture. Sustainability 2020, 12, 3096.

Lahens, J.R., 2014, L'aide internationale à Haïti favorise-t-elle le développement durable? Essai présenté au Centre universitaire de formation en environnement et développement durable en vue de l'obtention du grade de maître en environnement (M. Env.). Université de Sherbrooke.

Le Moniteur, Journal Officiel de la République d'Haïti : <http://www.sgcm.gouv.ht/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Moniteur-10-mai-2017.pdf>.

Le Moniteur, Loi Portant Création, Organisation et fonctionnement du service national de gestion des résidus solides (SNGRS) : <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/Hai172031.pdf>.

Lefebvre, V. & Mathieu, J., 2019, Évaluation à mi-parcours du projet PID 90545/PIMS 4648 «Amélioration de la résilience d'écosystèmes et de communautés vulnérables aux changements climatiques et aux menaces anthropiques par une approche, de la montagne à la mer de la conservation de la biodiversité et de la gestion des bassins versants».

Lozano-Gracia, N. et Lozano M.G., 2017, Les villes haïtiennes: des actions pour aujourd'hui avec un regard sur demain, Washington : World Bank

Maxwell, D., Stites, E., Robillard, S. C., Wagner, M., 2017, Conflict and Resilience: A Synthesis of Feinstein International Center Work on Building Resilience and Protecting Livelihoods in Conflict-related Crises. Boston: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University.

MDE (DPC), Centre d'opérations d'urgence national, 2016, Ouragan Matthew Rapport de situation #7.

Nations Unies Haïti, 2020, Addendum au bilan commun de pays (BCP) 2016

Nations Unies, 2017, Cadre de Développement Durable Haïti

Nations Unies, 2019, Résolution NU 2476

Nations Unies, Conseil de sécurité, Bureau intégré des Nations unies en Haïti, 2020, Rapport du Secrétaire Général S/2020/123

Nations-Unies, 2017, Haïti-Bilan commun de pays. Juin 2017

OCHA, 2020, Aperçu des besoins humanitaires - Haïti.

OECD, 1993, OECD core set of indicators for environmental performance reviews. Environmental Directorate Monographs No.83.

Pierre, H., 2015, Migrations, environnement et changements climatiques en Haïti. Organisation internationale pour les migrations (OIM).

PNUD Haiti, 2017, Stratégie pour la promotion de l'égalité des sexes, Cycle de programmation 2017-2021

PNUD Haiti, 2020, Compte Rendu de réunions des partenaires du processus électoral

PNUD, 2009, Guide de la planification du suivi et de l'évaluation axés sur les résultats du développement

PNUD, 2015, Guide Méthodologique de Réduction des Risques Naturels en zones urbaines en Haïti.

PNUD, Rapport 2013 sur les OMD.

PNUD, 2019, Appropriation nationale du Programme de développement durable à l'horizon 2030, Contribution du PNUD à l'élaboration de la feuille de route

Rapport de la consultation régionale pour l'Amérique latine et la Caraïbe pour l'étude de progrès sur la jeunesse, la paix et la sécurité, Panama Mai 2017

Renaud Voltaire, 2017, Projet Plan Prévention Séisme dans le Grand Nord d'Haïti – Les Leçons Apprises. Note inédite.

République d'Haïti Pimature, CIAT, Vers un aménagement durable et concerté du territoire Haitien : [http://ciat.gouv.ht/sites/default/files/docs/CIAT\\_Missions\\_du\\_CIAT\\_FR.pdf](http://ciat.gouv.ht/sites/default/files/docs/CIAT_Missions_du_CIAT_FR.pdf).

République d'Haïti, 2006, Décret portant gestion de l'environnement et de régulation de la conduite des citoyens et citoyennes pour un développement durable.

République d'Haïti, 2016, Guide méthodologique Réduction des risques naturels en zone urbaine en Haïti.

République d'Haïti, 2019, Plan national de gestion des risques de désastre 2019 – 2030.

République d'Haïti, 2020, Plan d'Action pour le Relèvement et le Développement d'Haïti

République d'Haïti, CIAT, 2016, Politique Nationale des Déchets Solides en Haïti - Table Régionale de Coordination pour Le Grand Sud.

République d'Haïti, Ministère de l'Économie et des Finances (MEF), Direction des Études Économiques et Prévisions (DEEP), 2018, Situation Économique et Financière d'Haïti et Perspectives – Exercice fiscale 2017-2018

République d'Haïti, Ministère de l'Environnement et PNUD, 2011, Conférence des Nations Unies sur le développement durable (Rio+20) Processus de préparation au niveau national. Rapport de synthèse sur les progrès réalisés en matière de développement durable en Haïti.

République d'Haïti, Ministère de l'Environnement, 2001, Première Communication Nationale sur les Changements Climatiques. MDE, UNFCCC, UNEP, GEF.

République d'Haïti, Ministère de l'Environnement, 2006, Plan d'Action National d'Adaptation (PANA).

République d'Haïti, Ministère de l'Environnement, 2015, Contribution Prévues Déterminées au niveau National.

République d'Haïti, Ministère de l'Environnement, 2015, Programme Aligné d'Action National de Lutte contre la Désertification.

République d'Haïti, Ministère de l'Intérieur et des collectivités territoriales (MICT), Direction de la Protection Civile (DPC), 2017, Document pays Haïti, 2017.

République d'Haïti, Ministère de la Planification et de la Coopération Externe, 2012, Plan Stratégique de Développement d'Haïti : Pays Émergent en 2030

République d'Haïti, Ministère des Affaires Sociales et du Travail, 2020, Politique nationale de protection et de promotion sociales

République d'Haïti, MPCE, 2016, Évaluation des Besoins post Catastrophe pour le Cyclone Mathieu. Rapport préparé par le Gouvernement de la République d'Haïti avec l'appui conjoint du Système des Nations Unies, de l'Union européenne, de la Banque interaméricaine de développement et de la Banque mondiale.

République d'Haïti, Ministère de la Planification et de la Coopération Externe, 2020, Cadre national de prévention et de relèvement des crises

Réseau de Systèmes d'Alerte Précoce contre la Famine, 2017, HAÏTI : Perspectives sur la sécurité alimentaire Octobre 2017 à mai 2018.

Schneiderbauer, S., Calliari, E., Eidsvig, U., & Hagenlocher, M., 2017, The most recent view of vulnerability. In: Poljanšek K.; Marin Ferrer M.; De Groeve T.; Clark, I. (eds.): "Science for Disaster Risk Management: Knowing better and losing less". Publications Office of the European Union.

Secteurs Sécurité alimentaire et Nutrition à Haïti, 2019, Alerte sur les besoins prioritaires 2019 - Version du 22 mars 2019.

Shah, A., 2017, Évaluation finale « Programme de réduction des risques naturels en zones urbaines ».

Simon, J.M., 2017, Services Énergétiques Renouvelables pour Tous - Projet P156719-Haïti.

Singh, B. et Cohen, M.J., 2014, Adaptation aux changements climatiques. Le cas d'Haïti. OXFAM America.

Singh, R. J., et Barton-Dock, M., 2016, Haïti des opportunités pour tous. Diagnostique Pays systématique. Banque Mondiale.

Tarter, A., 2015, Tarter, Andrew. 2015. Adaptive Arboreal Practice: Haitian Farmer Responses to Ongoing Deforestation. Dissertation. Department of Anthropology. University of Florida, Gainesville FL.

Tarter, A., Freeman, K. K., Ward, C., Sander, K., Theus, K., Coello, B., Fawaz, Y., Miles, M., Ahmed, T. T. G., 2018, Le charbon de bois en Haïti. Bilan national de la production de charbon de bois et évolution des habitudes en matière de consommation, Haiti Takes Root, Haitian Relief Organization, World Bank Group.

Timmerman, P., 1981, Vulnerability Resilience and Collapse of Society. A Review of Models and Possible Climatic Applications. Toronto, Canada. Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Toronto.

UN Haïti, UNDAF Haïti 2017-2021

UNDP Haïti, 2017, Country Programme Document 2017-2021

UNDP Haiti, 2020, Support to the National Response and Recovery to Contain the Impact of COVID-19.

UNDP Haiti, Organigram 2017

UNDP Haiti, Organigram 2020

UNDP Haiti, Results Oriented Annual Report - ROAR 2017

UNDP Haiti, Results Oriented Annual Report - ROAR 2018

UNDP Haiti, Results Oriented Annual Report - ROAR 2019

UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017

UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021

UNDP, 2016, UNDP Youth Global Programme for Sustainable Development and Peace 2016-2020

UNDP, 2019, Human Development Report 2019, Beyond income, beyond averages, beyond today: Inequalities in human development in the 21st century, New York: UNDP

UNDP, 2019, Rapport sur le développement humain 2019 - Les inégalités de développement humain au XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Note d'information à l'intention des pays concernant le Rapport sur le développement humain 2019 Haïti.

UNDP, 2019, Rapport UNDP scoping mission in Haiti - 21-25 October 2019

UNDRR, 2019, Local disaster risk reduction strategies and plans in urban areas.

UNEP, 2016, Haiti: South Department Forest Energy Supply Chains.

UNESCAP, ADB, UNDP, 2018, Transformation towards sustainable and resilient societies in Asia and the Pacific.

United Nations, 2020, SG report S/2020/123

United Nations, 2020, SG report S/2020/537

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2019, World Population Prospects 2019, Data Booklet.

UNSCR Résolution S/RES/2476 du 25 juin 2019

Van Vliet, G., Pressoir, G., Marzin, J. et Giordano, T., 2016, Une étude exhaustive et stratégique du secteur agricole/rural haïtien et des investissements publics requis pour son développement. CIRAD.

Winderl, T., 2014, Disaster Resilience Measurements - Stocktaking of Ongoing Efforts in Developing Systems for Measuring Resilience, UNDP.

World Bank, 2015, Country partnership framework for the Republic of Haiti for the period FY16-FY19

World Population Review, 2020, Gini Coefficient by Country by Population 2020: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/gini-coefficient-by-country>, 18 July 2020

## ANNEX 5. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME AND OUTPUT INDICATORS

Indicators	Baseline	Target 2021	Status (Progress/Regression)		
			2017	2018	2019
Outcome 1: The public institutions and civil society improve the rule of law and decentralization for good governance at all decision-making levels.					
Indicator 1.1 Taux de détention préventive prolongée et par prison civile (désagrégé par sexe et majeur/mineur).	72%	75%	76% (Target reached)	75% (Target maintained)	75% (Target maintained)
					Sources: Expertise indépendante des droits de l'homme qui fixe à 72% pour l'année 2016 et à 75% en 2018 selon la MINUJUSTH (avec 85% des femmes en prison sont en détention préventive prolongée et 83% des mineurs en conflit avec la loi sont en détention préventive prolongée).
					CO Comment: Le taux est supérieur ou égal à 75% en 2019. HQ Comment: Please set a baseline and a target.
Indicator 1.2 Pourcentage du budget de l'Etat alloué aux collectivités territoriales et aux services déconcentrés	2%	No set target	2% (No progress)	2% (No progress)	2% (No progress)
					CO Comment: Pour l'année 2016-2017, le Fonds de Gestion et de Développement des Collectivités Territoriales (FDGCT) est doté de 2,467,828,479 gourdes. Tenant en compte que le montant total du budget rectificatif pour le même cycle se hisse à 118,580,130,650 gourdes, le FDGCT représente donc un 2,08% du budget national. En ce sens, on constate une progression des fonds alloués aux collectivités territoriales, car le FDGCT représentait 1.41% du budget du cycle précédent, à savoir les années 2015-2016. En effet, le FDGCT a mobilisé 1,734,721,620 gourdes alors que le budget national s'élevait à 122,679,830,801
					La ligne de base reste 2% car le budget 2017-2018 a été reconduit pour l'exercice 2018-2019. HQ Comment: Please set a baseline and a target.
Indicator 1.3 Taux moyen de participation aux élections présidentielle, législative, municipale et	30%	No set target	27% (Regression)	30% (Some progress back to baseline)	30% (No progress)
					Sources: CEP, Election October 2015

locale (désagrégé par types d'élections, sexe, âge et zones géographiques si possible)					CO Comment: En raison du report des élections planifiées pour 2019 et possiblement planifiées pour la fin 2020, la ligne de base reste inchangée. (27.44% pour les élections ASEC, CASEC et délégués de ville de janvier 2017) HQ Comment: Please set a baseline and a target.
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 favourable and inclusive socio-economic and cultural environment.					
Indicator 2.1 Taux d'emploi (structuré et non structuré), ventilé par secteur et sous-secteur, sexe, âge et groupes exclus et par catégorie salariale lorsque ces données sont disponibles	3.8%	3.8%	3.8% (No progress)	3.8% (No progress)	24% (Significant progress)
					Sources: Enquête mortalité, morbidité et utilisation des services 2016-2017 (EMMUS-VI) Emploi : Plus de 26 % des hommes et 44 % des femmes Tendance : Le pourcentage de femmes ayant travaillé au cours des douze derniers mois a légèrement augmenté par rapport à l'EMMUS de 2012, passant de 52 % à 56 %. Pour les hommes, le pourcentage est resté inchangé (74 %).
					CO Comment: Dans le cadre de l'EMMUS-VI (2016-2017), on s'est intéressé au type d'occupation des enquêtés qui travaillaient. Parmi les femmes de 15-49 ans ayant travaillé durant les douze mois précédant l'enquête, 71 % étaient occupées dans le secteur des ventes et services ; dans 9 % des cas, les femmes occupaient un emploi qualifié, 8 % étaient employés de maison et le même pourcentage travaillait dans l'agriculture. En ce qui concerne les hommes, on constate que 37 % travaillaient dans l'agriculture, 24 % avaient un emploi manuel qualifié, 18 % un emploi technique qualifié, et 16 % travaillaient dans les ventes et services. Comparé à l'EMMUS de 2012, on n'observe pas de changements importants dans les secteurs d'activité économique occupés par les femmes. Par contre chez les hommes, le pourcentage occupant un emploi manuel qualifié est passé de 4 % durant l'EMMUS de 2012 à 24 % en 2017, tandis que le pourcentage occupé dans le secteur agricole continue de diminuer, passant de 44 % en 2012 à 37 % selon l'EMMUS actuelle. HQ Comments: Please set a baseline and a target.
Indicator 2.2 Pourcentage de la population ayant accès aux prestations sociales contributives et non	10%	No set target	10% (No progress)	10% (No progress)	10% (No progress)
					Sources: <a href="https://fr.slideshare.net/FAESHAI/TAI/presentation-ede-pepn">https://fr.slideshare.net/FAESHAI/TAI/presentation-ede-pepn</a> En attente de production de données par le PAM

contributives par sexe.					CO Comments: Données non disponible en 2019 on garde le baseline. Données non disponible en 2018 on garde le baseline. Estimation 10% selon la présentation de la stratégie Ede Pep du FAES (2013): <a href="https://fr.slideshare.net/FAESHAI/1/presentation-ede-pepn">https://fr.slideshare.net/FAESHAI/1/presentation-ede-pepn</a> En attente de production de données par le PAM HQ Comments: Please set a baseline and a target.
Indicator 2.3 Prévalence de l'insécurité alimentaire	41%	No set target	41% (No progress)	41% (No progress)	50.2% (Some progress)
					Source: Ministère de la santé publique et de la population, 2018. Haïti, Enquête mortalité, morbidité et utilisation des services (EMMUS VI), 2016-2017.
					CO Comments: 2,26 millions de personnes sont classées comme étant en situation d'insécurité alimentaire et ont besoin d'une aide humanitaire à cet égard. Selon l'analyse du cadre intégré de classification de la sécurité alimentaire (IPC) conduite en octobre 2019 au niveau national, 3,7 millions de personnes vivent en insécurité alimentaire aigüe dont 2,8 millions sont en milieu rural (38 % de la population rurale). HQ Comments: Please set a baseline and a target. What is the unit of this indicator? A percentage?
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.					
Indicator 3.1 Position d'Haïti dans l'indice pour la gestion des risques	6	6.5	6.5 (Target reached)	6.5 (Target maintained)	6.5 (Target maintained)
					Source: INFORM
Indicator 3.2 Cout en % du PIB des pertes économiques dues aux catastrophes.	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
					CO Comments: 2% (Les données de la Banque Mondiale pour l'année 2017 ne sont pas encore disponibles). HQ Comments: The target is less than 2%.
Indicator 3.3 Pourcentage d'aires protégées déclarées	No set baseline	45%	0%	n/a	0%



disposant d'un plan de gestion mis en œuvre par des entités nationales formées					<p>CO comments: Seulement 4 des 25 aires protégées existantes disposent d'un Plan de gestion. Le Ministère de l'Environnement, à travers divers initiatives, travaille avec les partenaires techniques et financiers de manière à doter les autres aires protégées d'une structure et d'un plan de gestion.</p> <p>Le PNUD, à travers le projet ABE, a Contribué à l'élaboration et la validation du plan de gestion du Parc national des trois Baies (PN3B) en collaboration avec la TNC (The Nature Conservancy) établi sur 75 406 ha, dans le cadre du Programme sur la biodiversité marine des Caraïbes (CMBP). Ce plan de gestion propose un modèle de cogestion entre ANAP, FoProBiM et le Comité Local d'Appui (CLA) du PN3B et les autorités locales afin de renforcer la gestion du PN3B et la conservation de ses ressources Naturelles.</p> <p>Le projet EBA a aussi apporté sa contribution dans le processus d'élaboration et de validation du Plan de gestion de l'Unité I de la Forêt des Pins</p> <p>L' action du PNUD a permis d'aboutir à la déclaration officielle de l'aire marine et terrestre protégée de Barradères Cayemites (départements Nippes et Grand' Anse, 87621 ha) ainsi que le Parc National Lagons des Huitres (département du Sud-Est, 9640 ha). Par ailleurs, un arrêté communal pour la préservation environnementale (zone non constructible) a été adopté au Cap Haïtien ainsi que deux arrêtés communaux, l'un sur la protection des aires marines protégées et l'autre fixant la réglementation des sennes de plage, élaborés dans le cadre de l'activité sur la pêche du projet EBA.</p> <p>2020: Inventaire des ressources naturelles /ligne de base complexe Marigot - Massif La Selle- Anse-à-Pitre et un plan d'aménagement territoriale pour ce meme complexe.</p>
					HQ Comment: Please set a baseline and a target.
Indicator 3.4 Nombre de km de plantation linéaires le long du littoral et des ravines réduisant les risques aux désastres.	No set baseline	No set target	0	n/a	88
					<p>CO Comments: Beaucoup de travaux ont été entrepris par les Ministères de l'Environnement et de l'Agriculture en collaboration avec des ONG et d'autres institutions nationales et internationales dans le but de réduire les risques aux désastres en Haiti.</p> <p>Après le passage des Ouragans Mathew et Irma, le projet ABE a mis en oeuvre des activités de protection de ravines au niveau des zones d'interventions. Ainsi, en collaboration avec les organisations communautaires de base, des seuils se sont érigés au niveau de certaines ravines sur environ 88 000 m linéaire</p>
					HQ Comment: Please set a baseline and a target.

Output Description	Output Indicator # /description	Output Indicator Baseline	Output Indicator Target by 2021	Output Indicator Value 2017	Output indicator value 2018	Output indicator value 2019	
Output 1.1: The capacities of State legal institutions are reinforced allowing women and men to enjoy greater access to formal justice and a safer environment.	Indicator 1.1.1 Existence and implementation of a new legal framework that facilitates a new policy of access to justice services.	No	Yes	No	No (No progress)	No (No progress) Source: Le Moniteur CO Comments: Loi sur l'Aide Legal adoptée mais pas encore mise en œuvre.	
	Indicator 1.1.2 Existence of a reformed criminal code that takes into account the promotion, protection and defence of fundamental rights and liberties, including gender-specific considerations	No	Yes	No	Yes (Progress)	Yes (No progress) Source: Code pénal révisé CO comments: Code pénal révisé soumis mais pas encore adopté par Parlement.	
	Indicator 1.1.3. Existence of a strategic plan for strengthening the organization of public security	No	Yes	Yes (Target reached)	Yes (Target maintained)	Yes (Target maintained) Source: Plan Stratégique Nationale de la Police Nationale D'Haiti + Plan stratégique de la PNH (2017-2021). Plan Stratégique de l'OPC (2019-2024) adopté en 2019	
Output 1.2: The functions financing and capacities of subnational institutions are strengthened in order to provide basic services and respond to the population's needs	Indicator 1.2.1 Percentage of legal and administrative measures recommended in the framework plan for State reform (administrative deconcentration and decentralization) that were finalized	1. Percentage of legal measures recommended in the framework plan for State reform (administrative deconcentration and decentralization) that were finalized	31%	50%	31% (No progress)	31% (No progress)	31% (No progress) CO Comments: Données non disponible pour 2017 et 2018, le baseline est rapporté à la place
		2. Percentage of administrative measures recommended in the framework plan for State reform (administrative deconcentration and decentralization) that were finalized	14%	50%	14% (No progress)	14% (No progress)	14% (No progress) CO Comments: Données non disponible pour 2017 et 2018, le baseline est rapporté à la place

	Indicator 1.2.2 Number of departments in which the coordination of deconcentrated services by the delegations were undertaken through a planning and monitoring mechanism.		1	5	1 (No progress)	1 (No progress)	1 (No progress) CO Comments: Données non disponible pour 2017, 2018 et 2019, on rapporte la valeur de la ligne de base.
	Indicator 1.2.3 Percentage of increase in total amount of local taxes collected from all communes of the country		0%	25%	0% (No progress)	0% (No progress)	0% (No progress) CO Comments: La pression fiscale en Haïti est très faible vu le contexte socioéconomique et politique. En absence de données actualisées pour 2019, on rapporte la valeur de la ligne de base.
Output 1.3: Subnational development plans are gender-sensitive and in line with the sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Indicator 1.3.1 Percentage of communes with a communal development plan including gender goals and sex-disaggregated objectives		0%	25%	0% (No progress)	0% (no progress)	0% (No progress) Source: Ministère de la planification et de la coopération externe MPCE, Ministère de l'Interieur et des Collectivites Territoriales (MICT) CO Comments: Parmi les 12 communes frontalières appuyées par le projet AGLDT en 2019, 2 d'entre elles sont en train d'élaborer leur PCD. L'aspect genre et les ODD sont pris en compte.
	Indicator 1.3.2 Number of existing departmental development strategies, and percentage of them aligned with the SDGs	1. Number of existing departmental development strategies	2	5	2 (No progress)	2 (No progress)	4 (Some progress) Source: Ministère de la planification et de la coopération externe MPCE, MICT CO Comments: Il existe un document d'évaluation des capacités des 10 Directions Départementales du MPCE de la bande frontalière élaboré par le projet en 2019.
		2. Percentage of existing departmental development strategies, aligned with the SDGs	0%	60%	0% (No progress)	0% (no progress)	0% (No progress) Source: Ministère de la planification et de la coopération externe MPCE Mnistere de l'Interieur et des Collectivites Territoriales (MICT) CO Comments: Ce document d'évaluation des capacités des 10 Directions Départementales du MPCE de la bande frontalière n'a pas abordé l'aspect ODD.
Output 1.4: Mechanisms instruments and spaces of	Indicator 1.4.1 No. of social accountability mechanisms linked to public services provision created at departmental and communal level		0	5	0 (No progress)	0 (No progress)	0 (No progress)

communication dialogue and interaction between the State and citizens to increase citizen control are in place and operational.	Indicator 1.4.2 Percentage of women	1. Percentage of women in elected positions (Chambre des députés)	0%	30%	25% (Some progress)	25% (No progress)	25% (No progress) Source: Données CEP
		2. Percentage of women (Au niveau municipal)	35%	40%	35% (No progress)	35% (No progress)	35% (No progress) Source: Données CEP
Output 2.1: The available options for inclusive and sustainable social protection are operational and supported.	Indicator 2.1.1	No. of social protection institutions that have reviewed targeting of their beneficiaries in order to better respond to the needs of the most vulnerable	0	2	0 (No progress)	0 (no progress)	1 (Some progress) Source: UOPES CO Comments: Les travaux interministériels qui devraient être initiés en 2019 dans le cadre des ODD permettront de suivre de façon plus précise cet indicateur.
	Indicator 2.1.2	Number of public institutions that have received the UOPES SDG seal	0	4	0 (No progress)	0 (no progress)	0 (no progress) CO Comments: Le PNUD ne dispose pas de données actualisées pour cet indicateur. Les travaux interministériels qui devraient être initiés en 2019 dans le cadre des ODD permettront de suivre de façon plus précise cet indicateur.
	Indicator 2.1.3.	No. of sectoral ministries whose budget and investment plans are gender-sensitive	0	3	0 (no progress)	0 (No progress)	1 (some progress) Source: Ministère a la Condition Feminine et aux Droits de la Femme CO Comments: Le Budget national 2017-2018 a été reconduit pour une deuxième année consécutive (2020-2021). Cependant les investissements et l'exécution du budget ont suivi les prescrits de la politique d'égalité de sexes du Ministère a la condition féminine et au droit de la femme. Le PNUD planifie d'appuyer Ministère a la condition féminine et au droit de la femme, MCFDF dans l'évaluation et l'actualisation de sa politique d'égalité femmes hommes 2014-2034 et son plan d'action.
	Indicator 2.1.4.	National statistical policy in place and implemented	No	Yes	No (No progress)	No (No progress)	No (No progress) CO Comments: Les travaux interministériels qui devraient être initiés en 2019 dans le cadre des ODD permettront de suivre de façon plus précise cet indicateur.

Output 2.2: Women and youth benefit from facilitated access to economic opportunities including in the formal job market.	Indicator 2.2.1 No. of unemployed persons trained to seek employment in formal economy, by age and sex	900	3400	900 (No progress)	900 (No progress)	900 (No progress) Source: Ministere du Travail CO Comments: Pas de donnees disponible pour les resultats de 2017 a 2019, le baseline a ete considere.
	Indicator 2.2.2 No. of new micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises in supported value chains, disaggregated	50	250	82 (Some progress)	125 (Some progress)	150 (Some progress) Source: Ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie (MCI) <a href="http://haiti24.net/papej-jovenel-moise-remet-des-cheques-a-une-nouvelle-cohorte-de-jeunes-entrepreneurs/">http://haiti24.net/papej-jovenel-moise-remet-des-cheques-a-une-nouvelle-cohorte-de-jeunes-entrepreneurs/</a> CO Comments: Les donnees pour le PNUD ont été rapportées dans le IRFF pour l'annee 2019. Mais nous ne disposons pas de donnees completes et valides pour le pays. Les donnees reportees sont une estimation.
	Indicator 2.2.3. No. of new sustainable jobs and livelihoods created, disaggregated	350000	350000	350000 (Target maintained)	350000 (Target maintained)	350000 (Target maintained) Source: IHSI <a href="http://www.ihsi.ht/produit_economie_ie_pres.html">http://www.ihsi.ht/produit_economie_ie_pres.html</a> CO Comments: Le PNUD ne dispose pas de données actualisées pour cet indicateur. Cependant selon IHSI l'indice d'emploi a encore baisse pour l'annee 2019. Indice d'Emploi a affiché à nouveau une tendance baissière au 1er trimestre de l'année fiscale 2019, soit une chute de 1.2 %.
Output 2.3: 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-	Indicator 2.3.1 No. of new rural development programmes aligned with the sustainable development goals implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture	1	3	1 (No progress)	1 (No progress)	2 (Some progress) Source: Ministere de L'Agriculture, des Ressources Naturelles et du Developpement (MARNDP) CO Comments: Les donnees pour le PNUD ont été rapportées dans le IRFF mais nous ne disposons pas de donnees pour le pays.
	Indicator 2.3.2. No. of rural households with access to small-scale irrigation on their plots	21000	49000	21000 (No progress)	21000 (No progress)	21000 (No progress) Source: Ministere de L'Agriculture, des Ressources Naturelles et du Developpement (MARNDP) CO Comments: Les donnees pour le PNUD ont été rapportées dans le IRFF mais nous ne disposons pas de donnees pour le pays.

generating.						
Output 3.1: National actors have the knowledge capacities and necessary tools to improve natural resources management and risk reduction and management.	Indicator 3.1.1 No. of multi-risk maps and risk reduction plans that take into consideration the differentiated impact of risks for women and men	0	not defined	n/a	n/a	37 CO Comments: Projet Cartographie multirisques et gestion de l'occupation du sol - Nord'Ouest 2019 : Réalisation de 13 cartes communales, 9 cartes thématiques (points d'eau, végétation etc..) et 1 carte départementale pour l'aléa Sécheresse et de 13 cartes communales et 1 carte départementale pour l'aléa Submersion marine et Tsunami  2020: Réalisation de 13 cartes communales et 1 carte départementale pour chacun des aléas suivants: Mouvement de terrain, dégradation des sols et inondation  Projet Renforcement de la prévention des risques naturels et de la gouvernance territoriale - Sud 2019: Réalisation par le projet Renforcement de la prévention des risques naturels et de la gouvernance territoriale, de 4 cartes multirisques départementaux sur 4 aléas : Sismique, Mouvement de terrain, Sécheresse et dégradation de sol, Inondation et subversion marine  2020: Finalisation des 4 cartes multirisques départementaux pour le Nord'Ouest
	Indicator 3.1.2 No. of legislative or regulatory measures taken to improve risk management linked to environmental vulnerability	not defined	4	n/a	n/a	2 CO comments: Soumission au parlement d'un projet de loi portant la création du Système National de Gestion des Risques et Désastres (SNGRD) et d'un projet de loi créant la Direction Générale de la Protection Civile (DGPC)

	Indicator 3.1.3. No. of community or commercial initiatives and/or new regulatory measures implemented at the local level to reduce vulnerability of water resources to climate change hazards	not defined	not defined	n/a	n/a	2 CO Comments: Le projet EBA travaille sur la réhabilitation de deux Lacs collinaires dans la région de Belle-Anse en vue d'augmenter leurs étanchéités par la mise en place d'une géomembrane et la protection des berges par la revégétalisation.
	Indicator 3.1.4. Existence of a national database on losses and damages due to disaster, disaggregated by sex and age	not defined	Yes	n/a	n/a	Yes (Target maintained) CO comments: 2019 : Création de l'architecture d'une base de données nationale sur les pertes et dommages dus aux catastrophes et aux changements climatiques 2020: Implementation de la base de données.
Output 3.2: Mechanisms and partnerships are set up to promote sustainable modes of production distribution and consumption.	Indicator 3.2.1: No. of new mechanisms and partnerships at national and local levels that are financed, disaggregated by type of partnership	not defined	2	n/a	n/a	1 Source: Document d'Accord signé CO Comments: Le projet de Renforcement de la prévention des risques naturels et de la gouvernance territoriale a signé un Accord de partenariat avec l'Université d'Etat d'Haiti (UEH) dans le cadre d'un appui au Master Géosciences (URGéo) de la Faculté des Sciences (FDS).
Output 3.3: The capacities of public administrations to enforce the application of environmental norms and good practices are strengthened.	Indicator 3.3.1 No. of regulations adopted for the preservation, sustainable management and sharing of benefits of the natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems	0	5	n/a	n/a	3 (Some progress) CO Comments: Le projet ABE accompagne le Ministère de l'Environnement dans la mise en place de plusieurs outils dans le cadre du renforcement de capacités du Bureau National de l'Evaluation Environnementale (BNEE). 2019 : Guides méthodologiques sur l'Evaluation Environnementale Stratégiques (EES) pour trois secteurs (Agriculture, Transport, Energie)
	Indicator 3.3.2 No. of effectively processed files within the Ministry of the Environment for environmental non-objections	not defined	40	n/a	n/a	20 Source: Bureau de l'Evaluation Environnementale (BNEE) CO Comments: Au cours de l'année 2019, le Bureau National de l'Evaluation Environnementale (BNEE) a traité 20 dossiers, relatifs aux demandes de non-objection environnementale, desquels 18 non-objections ont été accordées.

Source: UNDP Corporate Planning System

# ANNEX 6. PROJECT LIST

PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	OUTPUT ID	OUTPUT DESCRIPTION	START YEAR	END YEAR	GENDER MARKER	2017 BUDGET	2017 EXPENDITURE	2018 BUDGET	2018 EXPENDITURE	2019 BUDGET	2019 EXPENDITURE	2020 BUDGET	2020 EXPENDITURE	Total BUDGET	Total EXPENDITURE
Outcome 1: The public institutions and civil society improve the rule of law and decentralization for good governance at all decision-making levels.																
00057026	Appui au programme	00070275	Appui au programme	2009	2019	GEN1	\$1,112,977.17	\$974,810.25	\$1,060,832.45	\$820,941.02	\$0.00	\$3,016.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,173,809.62	\$1,798,767.27
00076471	Appui au Cycle Electoral	00087841	Opérations électorales	2013	2020	GEN1	\$9,480,812.07	\$5,427,027.72	\$68,656.01	\$30,354.40	\$4.00	-\$249.58	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$9,549,476.08	\$5,457,132.54
00078904	Renforcement de l'Etat de droit en Haiti	00089014	Appui au secteur Etat de droit	2014	2018	GEN2	\$113,458.22	\$105,557.56	\$1.00	-\$19,076.39					\$113,459.22	\$86,481.17
00084852	Appui Gouvernance Locale et Developpement Territorial	00092678	Conception et MO des reformes	2017	2023	GEN2	\$178,870.75	\$159,221.09	\$626,826.00	\$641,584.09	\$569,000.00	\$554,611.92	\$551,800.00	\$294,742.46	\$1,926,496.75	\$1,650,159.56
		00103978	Modernisation des Intittutions	2017	2023	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$215,045.17	\$48,884.26	\$502,920.00	\$376,048.29	\$466,871.04	\$159,308.85	\$1,184,836.21	\$584,241.40
		00103979	Developpement des Territoires	2017	2023	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$169,000.00	\$78,470.13	\$357,564.00	\$305,742.25	\$574,490.00	\$149,078.62	\$1,101,054.00	\$533,291.00
00097737	Haiti Joint Interim Rule of Law Programme in Haiti	00101344	Improved safety and security	2016	2020	GEN2	\$2,173,341.79	\$1,802,303.15	\$1,812,768.17	\$1,443,706.55	\$1,891,181.60	\$1,772,153.41	\$1,251,817.00	\$563,737.75	\$7,129,108.56	\$5,581,900.86
		00102007	Respects of human rights	2016	2020	GEN2	\$1,862,843.00	\$1,772,579.85	\$534,391.00	\$502,979.20	\$983,943.42	\$844,290.73	\$556,607.24	\$165,086.66	\$3,937,784.66	\$3,284,936.44
		00102008	Improved access to justice	2016	2020	GEN2	\$283,699.86	\$160,857.03	\$380,063.00	\$284,515.75	\$1,132,367.49	\$861,440.47	\$671,962.48	\$449,061.09	\$2,468,092.83	\$1,755,874.34
00106385	Being LGBTI in the Caribbean	00107155	Nat & Reg Advocacy Support	2017	2021	GEN3	\$7,041.43	\$0.00	\$4,870.00	\$0.00					\$11,911.43	\$0.00
00109121	Promotion de la cohésion sociale à Jérémie	00108537	Cohésion sociale à Jérémie	2018	2020	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$282,759.00	\$144,361.53	\$529,125.00	\$465,375.83	\$814,401.27	\$456,668.66	\$1,626,285.27	\$1,066,406.02
00112974	Plan d'initiation appui aux institutions électorales	00111268	Plan d'initiation électorale	2018	2019	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$458,057.00	\$453,925.25	\$403,353.00	\$268,555.21	\$0.00	-\$15.72	\$861,410.00	\$722,464.74
00114690	Appui au Processus Électoral en Haiti (PAPEH)	00112608	Renforcement des capacités	2019	2022	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$308,702.00	\$225,643.91	\$308,702.00	\$225,643.91
00117306	Appui stratégique au bureau	00114147	Appui stratégique au programme	2019	2021	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$361,533.48	\$347,653.85	\$975,084.52	\$523,720.61	\$1,336,618.00	\$871,374.46
00120974	Reduction violence communautaire	00116949	Reduction violence CNDDR	2019	2019	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$179,430.57	\$172,356.09	\$0.00	-\$83.27	\$179,430.57	\$172,272.82
00123067	Preparation of Capacity Buildg for Transparency Project	00118418	Project Development	2020	2020	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$13,349.40	\$50,000.00	\$13,349.40
00125722	Spotlight initiative in Haiti	00120001	Spotlight Initiative in Haiti	2020	2022	GEN3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$580,357.08	\$98,625.80	\$580,357.08	\$98,625.80
00125750	Contrôle des armes & des munitions	00120024	Controle des armes & munitions	2020	2022	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$312,996.96	\$92,912.14	\$312,996.96	\$92,912.14
00125751	Renforcer l'accès à la justice	00120027	Renforcer l'accès à la justice	2020	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$612,000.00	\$233,075.41	\$612,000.00	\$233,075.41
<b>Subtotal outcome 1</b>							<b>\$15,213,044.29</b>	<b>\$10,402,356.65</b>	<b>\$5,613,268.80</b>	<b>\$4,430,645.79</b>	<b>\$6,910,422.56</b>	<b>\$5,970,994.47</b>	<b>\$7,727,093.59</b>	<b>\$3,424,912.37</b>	<b>\$35,463,829.24</b>	<b>\$24,228,909.28</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 favourable and inclusive socio-economic and cultural environment.																
00068002	Appui technique aux programmes de transferts conditionne	00083446	Appui Technique Transferts	2012	2019	GEN1	\$60,000.00	\$33,442.95	\$5,527.89	\$2,070.09	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$65,527.89	\$35,513.04
00069083	Creation d'emplois inclusifs	00083866	Emplois Inclusifs	2012	2019	GEN2	\$702,000.00	\$684,182.45	\$307,231.67	\$245,686.12	\$43,892.00	\$42,161.35			\$1,053,123.67	\$972,029.92
00078703	Participation du PNUD au projet pilote " Sites et Servic	00088811	Sites et Services	2014	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	-\$679.46	\$103,451.40	\$85,522.84	\$58,289.48	\$56,191.37	\$60,000.00	\$25,589.42	\$221,740.88	\$166,624.17



00079220	PROHUERTA (Promotion des jardins potagers)	00089277	PROHUERTA	2014	2019	GEN1	\$177,069.35	\$84,254.02	\$96,371.80	\$84,743.64	\$24,779.37	-\$1,290.98			\$298,220.52	\$167,706.68
00090651	Appui à la gestion opérationnelle des Projets PPI	00096317	Appui à la gestion opera PPI-2	2015	2017	GEN2	\$516,436.29	\$516,425.61							\$516,436.29	\$516,425.61
		00097792	Appui à la gestion opera PPI-3	2015	2019	GEN2	\$3,846,343.59	\$3,882,876.01	\$4,579,480.07	\$4,543,929.70	\$1,265,303.00	\$1,191,712.71	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,691,126.66	\$9,618,518.42
00092199	Renforcement de la capacité de l'UCP des Projets PPI	00097015	Renforcement capacités UCP PPI	2015	2020	GEN2	\$652,341.00	\$657,361.39	\$548,607.09	\$518,833.73	\$276,143.00	\$216,669.13	\$285,178.00	\$116,378.19	\$1,762,269.09	\$1,509,242.44
00092415	Renforcement des capacités des cadres du MARNDR	00097138	Formation 100 cadres du MARNDR	2016	2019	GEN1	\$277,149.00	\$271,187.32	\$355,583.00	\$293,393.47	\$62,327.00	\$10,592.56	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$695,059.00	\$575,173.35
00095226	BRA/16/004 - Support to Education & Training in Haiti	00099222	BRA/16/004 - Educ Prog Haiti	2016	2021	GEN2	\$162,712.10	\$146,847.02	\$514,098.98	\$539,203.75	\$1,371,973.55	\$1,265,969.42	\$7,364,629.51	\$1,833,512.59	\$9,413,414.14	\$3,785,532.78
00099803	MICROENTERPRISE CREATION IN POOR AREAS OF PORT-AU-PRINCE	00103056	Economic empowerment in Haiti	2018	2021	GEN3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$242,560.14	\$234,728.05	\$1,928,888.70	\$1,811,159.78	\$1,093,394.19	\$610,370.12	\$3,264,843.03	\$2,656,257.95
00099905	Programme de relèvement post-Matthew	00103114	Recovery Capacities - Matthew	2016	2020	GEN1	\$180,000.00	\$163,615.39	\$520,979.10	\$465,310.26	\$2,349,159.92	\$2,265,873.99	\$2,303,080.92	\$1,323,444.19	\$5,353,219.94	\$4,218,243.83
		00103320	Early recovery - Matthew	2016	2019	GEN2	\$4,271,418.80	\$4,116,029.30	\$968,862.11	\$675,285.48	\$29,479.00	\$19,744.60	\$1.00	-\$46.96	\$5,269,760.91	\$4,811,012.42
		00105326	Long term recovery - Matthew	2016	2021	GEN2	\$150,000.00	\$133,512.53	\$606,202.43	\$633,251.26	\$859,396.46	\$798,464.28	\$2,553,649.61	\$633,273.00	\$4,169,248.50	\$2,198,501.07
00101615	Assistance Technique pour la gestion intégrée des marchés	00103971	Assistance technique	2017	2020	GEN2	\$274,503.49	\$262,258.27	\$136,840.33	\$93,445.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$411,343.82	\$355,703.68
00104208	Community assistance	00105895	Comm. assistance to Mirebalais	2017	2020	GEN1	\$101,605.77	\$101,286.44	\$710,904.58	\$672,954.66	\$361,154.23	\$358,234.30	\$276,621.01	\$230,621.84	\$1,450,285.59	\$1,363,097.24
		00116969	Phase 2 of comm. assistance	2017	2021	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$578,180.50	\$456,361.39	\$536,207.00	\$314,338.31	\$1,114,387.50	\$770,699.70
00108809	elaboration du document de projet Paysages Productifs	00108403	Elaboration de projet	2018	2019	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$98,229.40	\$98,209.60	\$3,597.60	\$3,506.60			\$101,827.00	\$101,716.20
00117889	SUPPORT TO THE ACCELERATION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOP GOALS	00114935	Support to SDGs	2019	2020	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,223,000.00	\$1,222,759.23	\$229,689.00	\$57,288.88	\$1,452,689.00	\$1,280,048.11
00128724	Cadre Intégré National pour le Finance du Dév en Haiti	00122641	Policy and Financing options	2020	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$55,000.00	\$0.00	\$55,000.00	\$0.00
<b>Subtotal outcome 2</b>							<b>\$11,371,579.39</b>	<b>\$11,052,599.24</b>	<b>\$9,794,929.99</b>	<b>\$9,186,568.06</b>	<b>\$10,435,563.81</b>	<b>\$9,718,109.73</b>	<b>\$14,757,450.24</b>	<b>\$5,144,769.58</b>	<b>\$46,359,523.43</b>	<b>\$35,102,046.61</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.																
00062058	Plan de Prévention Séisme Grand Nord D'Haiti	00079299	Prévention séisme Grand Nord	2011	2020	GEN1	\$815,733.31	\$739,904.46	\$134,798.00	\$116,483.26	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,538.59	-\$14,680.00	\$963,069.90	\$841,707.72
00071231	Projet d'Appui au Renforcement des Capacités du MDE	00084835	Renforcement Capacités MDE	2013	2017	GEN1	\$111,474.00	\$64,313.52							\$111,474.00	\$64,313.52
00075836	Réduction des risques dans les zones urbaines en Haiti	00087524	Réduction des risques Urbains	2013	2018	GEN1	\$12,024.00	-\$595.17	\$4,405.00	\$1,879.37					\$16,429.00	\$1,284.20
		00095653	Prep & Diffus. Guide Methodol.	2015	2018	GEN1	\$469,306.00	\$470,259.98	\$4,800.00	\$0.00					\$474,106.00	\$470,259.98
		00095654	Preparation Reponse aux desast	2013	2017	GEN1	\$61,556.00	\$52,227.22							\$61,556.00	\$52,227.22
00076717	PRD SNGRD	00087962	Ref. Cap. de Coord & Gest Oper	2013	2018	GEN1	\$1,155,250.71	\$1,023,516.47	\$0.00	\$30.03					\$1,155,250.71	\$1,023,546.50
		00087963	Formation des Volontaires	2013	2018	GEN1	\$527,603.67	\$519,281.64	\$0.00	\$0.00					\$527,603.67	\$519,281.64
00081100	Adaptation basée sur les écosystèmes	00090545	Ecosystem Resilience	2015	2021	GEN1	\$1,642,865.00	\$1,611,672.66	\$2,648,700.00	\$2,569,453.94	\$2,840,000.00	\$2,641,974.61	\$1,727,341.59	\$1,294,761.88	\$8,858,906.59	\$8,117,863.09
00084890	Résilience aux désastres département Nord	00092703	CONAISSANCE RISK-VULNERABILITE	2015	2019	GEN1	\$955,385.16	\$810,595.29	\$1,129,997.00	\$1,142,389.47	\$5,630.06	\$5,223.86	\$0.00	-\$3.03	\$2,091,012.22	\$1,958,205.59
		00095668	PROTECT-SAUVEGARDE-MITIGATION	2015	2019	GEN2	\$557,279.58	\$271,062.00	\$335,476.00	\$322,497.98	\$3,979.00	\$4,232.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$896,734.58	\$597,792.43
		00095689	INSTRUCTION & SENSIBILISATION	2015	2019	GEN1	\$151,771.12	\$107,408.70	\$153,647.00	\$137,075.26	\$3,943.00	\$3,919.08			\$309,361.12	\$248,403.04
		00095728	PREP. REPOSE & INTERVENTION	2015	2019	GEN1	\$144,988.92	\$140,441.27	\$619,307.00	\$599,025.05	\$20,283.00	\$18,693.14	\$0.00	-\$2.15	\$784,578.92	\$758,157.31

00091037	Appui au Systeme National GRD	00096501	Préparation & Reponses aux Urg	2015	2018	GEN1	\$167,217.30	\$165,814.46	\$3,465.00	\$3,465.00					\$170,682.30	\$169,279.46
00093932	PRP for Ozone Depleting Substances - Continuation 40307	00120534	HA/SEV/84/TAS/23-Enabling Act	2020	2021	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$35,000.00	\$0.00	\$35,000.00	\$0.00
00096183	Increasing Human Security to DRR	00100173	Incr. Human Security to DRR	2016	2019	GEN1	\$702,408.99	\$169,641.84	\$438,399.81	\$418,695.74	\$799,186.40	\$689,444.89	\$29,890.00	-\$1,437.51	\$1,969,885.20	\$1,276,344.96
00098311	Appui à la table sectorielle et thématique GRD	00101681	Appui table sectorielle GRD	2016	2019	GEN1	\$600,576.50	\$516,872.31	\$285,395.45	\$284,615.01	\$460,162.54	\$322,336.39	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,346,134.49	\$1,123,823.71
00099802	Project for Strengthening the Solid Waste Management Sys	00103055	Renforcement Gestion dechets	2018	2022	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$234,184.00	\$240,634.46	\$770,723.56	\$738,544.59	\$1,215,060.00	\$445,897.89	\$2,219,967.56	\$1,425,076.94
00099975	CARTOGRAPHIE MULTIRISQUES ET GESTION DU SOL	00103155	CARTOGRAPHIE MULTIRISQUES N-O	2017	2021	GEN1	\$237,730.31	\$224,924.96	\$961,544.52	\$913,079.68	\$535,694.23	\$397,250.92	\$339,148.54	\$225,641.45	\$2,074,117.60	\$1,760,897.01
00103653	Initiation de propositions au Fonds Vert pour le Climat	00105577	Initiation de propositions	2017	2018	GEN1	\$79,011.39	\$78,060.44	\$1.00	-\$3,334.73					\$79,012.39	\$74,725.71
00104020	Electrification Rurale et Autonomisation des Femmes	00105768	Acces a l'electricite	2018	2022	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$546,688.51	\$376,748.04	\$702,573.74	\$634,650.45	\$1,572,586.59	\$710,003.88	\$2,821,848.84	\$1,721,402.37
00104703	Green Climate Fund Readiness Programme in Haiti	00106157	Readiness Programme in Haiti	2017	2019	GEN2	\$31,153.00	\$27,095.14	\$269,980.27	\$269,102.41	\$94,711.45	\$79,621.98			\$395,844.72	\$375,819.53
00105580	Appui à la Préparation et à la Gestion des Désastres (Ha)	00106783	Gestion des désastres	2017	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$232,473.24	\$246,598.09	\$1,432,725.00	\$1,420,382.52	\$1,281,503.57	\$744,690.80	\$2,946,701.81	\$2,411,671.41
00107533	Readiness private sector	00107815	Readiness private sector	2018	2019	GEN0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$180,720.00	\$161,566.10	\$156,616.00	\$156,547.18			\$337,336.00	\$318,113.28
00107538	Elaboration de projets Green Climate Fund	00107822	Projets du Green Climate Fund	2018	2019	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$296,200.00	\$242,845.31	\$70,000.00	\$68,182.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$366,200.00	\$311,027.98
00114040	Prévention risques naturels et gouvernance territoriale	00112252	Risques naturels & Gouvernance	2019	2021	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$914,828.16	\$774,857.73	\$984,184.56	\$465,480.92	\$1,899,012.72	\$1,240,338.65
00118663	Plan d'élimination des Hydrochlorofluorocarbures	00115387	Elimination fluide frigorigène	2019	2020	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$93,119.00	\$29,884.13	\$55,448.87	\$1,629.57	\$148,567.87	\$31,513.70
00118791	National Adaptation Plan	00115470	National Adaptation Plan	2019	2023	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$76,635.00	\$52,837.22	\$755,201.00	\$242,426.98	\$831,836.00	\$295,264.20
00121094	Elaboration de propositions de projet Environnement	00117008	Elaboration de propositions	2019	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,852.00	\$8,596.69	\$78,610.00	\$40,425.79	\$88,462.00	\$49,022.48
00124739	SIDA UNDP Strategic Collaboration on Env and CC	00120005	ProgC: Climate Change & Energy	2020	2020	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,800.00	\$0.00	\$21,800.00	\$0.00
00126804	Climate Promise Haiti	00120752	Revision Contribution National	2020	2021	GEN1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$110,000.00	\$1,536.21	\$110,000.00	\$1,536.21
00126923	Reponse a la Crise COVID19 en Haiti	00120852	Coordination et Reponse	2020	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$235,500.00	\$190,455.12	\$235,500.00	\$190,455.12
		00121255	Support socioEconomie	2020	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$545,900.00	\$505,291.68	\$545,900.00	\$505,291.68
		00121256	Renforcement Systeme Sanitaire	2020	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$930,448.12	\$535,759.50	\$930,448.12	\$535,759.50
00128057	PPG Résilience du secteur Eau	00121952	PPG Résilience du secteur Eau	2020	2021	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$67,400.00	\$0.00	\$67,400.00	\$0.00
00128342	Installation Pompes Solaires	00122363	Installation Pompes Solaires	2020	2022	GEN2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,780.00	\$0.00	\$36,780.00	\$0.00
<b>Subtotal outcome 3</b>							<b>\$8,423,334.96</b>	<b>\$6,992,497.19</b>	<b>\$8,480,181.80</b>	<b>\$8,042,849.47</b>	<b>\$8,990,662.14</b>	<b>\$8,047,180.50</b>	<b>\$10,034,341.43</b>	<b>\$5,387,878.98</b>	<b>\$35,928,520.33</b>	<b>\$28,470,406.14</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>							<b>\$35,007,958.64</b>	<b>\$28,447,453.08</b>	<b>\$23,888,380.59</b>	<b>\$21,660,063.32</b>	<b>\$26,336,648.51</b>	<b>\$23,736,284.70</b>	<b>\$32,518,885.26</b>	<b>\$13,957,560.93</b>	<b>\$117,751,873.00</b>	<b>\$87,801,362.03</b>

Source: Atlas Project data, Power Bi, September 2020