

Terms of Reference
for
Terminal Evaluation of the Project

Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Haiti

PIMS: 3414

Republic of Haiti

CONTENTS

1.	Project Summary	2
2.	Introduction.....	2
3.	Evaluation Objectives.....	2
4.	Evaluation Criteria	3
4.1	Project Formulation	3
4.2	Project Implementation.....	3
4.3	Project Results	5
4.4	Conclusions, recommendations & lessons	7
5.	Evaluation approach and method	7
6.	Implementation arrangements	8
7.	Evaluation deliverables	8
8.	Evaluation report review process	8
9.	Evaluation timeframe	9
10.	Evaluation Team	9
11.	Team Qualities:.....	9
12.	Evaluator Ethics	10
13.	Payment modalities and specifications	11
14.	Application process	11
	Annex 1: Project Logical Framework	12
	Annex 2: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators.....	15
	Annex 3: Evaluation Rating Scales	15
	Annex 4: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form	16
	Annex 5: Evaluation Report Outline	17
	Annex 6: Evaluation Report Clearance Form.....	19

1. Project Summary

Project Title:	Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Haiti			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS3414		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	46489	GEF financing:	500,000	500,000
Country:	Republic of Haiti	IA/EA own:	150,000	156000
Region:	Caribbean	Government:	1,655,000 in kind	
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other:	175,000 in kind	
Operational Program:	OP 15	Total co-financing:	1,980,000	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment	Total Project Cost:	2,480,000	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Agriculture	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		17 dember 2007xxxx
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: August 2010	Actual: December 2011

2. Introduction

In accordance with UNDP-GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized country projects supported by UNDP with GEF and other financing should undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. This Terms of Reference sets out the scope, methodology, content, timing and team composition expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Haiti Project (PIMS # 3414)

The long-term goal of the project was to contribute to global benefits through the promotion of Sustainable Land Management initiatives that would enhance and maintain ecosystem productivity and ecological functions through capacity building in and mainstreaming for SLM. The objective of the project was to contribute to reversing land degradation trends through the creation of an enabling environment for SLM by developing capacities within appropriate government and civil society institutions/user groups and mainstreaming into government planning and strategy development to halt and where feasible to reverse desertification processes in Haiti. The project had 4 outcomes: i) SLM principles are mainstreamed into national policies, plans and legislation; ii) Capacity building for SLM is enhanced through training and inter-sectoral approaches; iii) Capacities for knowledge and awareness for SLM strategies and options are developed including by development of Land Information Systems and land tenure assessments; and, iv) Resource mobilization in support of SLM is enhanced and an Investment Plan is developed. The lead executing agency was the Ministry of Environment in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture.

3. Evaluation Objectives

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects (a copy of this document can be either downloaded from the UNDP website or requested from the project Management Unit).

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in the Project Document and other related documents
- Assess project relevance to national priorities, as well as UNDP and GEF strategic objectives
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project
- Critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the project

- Assess the sustainability of the project interventions.
- Document lessons and best practices concerning project design, implementation and management which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

Project performance will be measured based on the Project Logical Framework (see Annex 1), which provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

4. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will cover six major criteria: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, sustainability and impact**. These evaluation criteria are further defined through a series of questions covering all aspects of the project intervention, broken out in three main sections as follows:

4.1 Project Formulation

The evaluation will include an assessment of the Project Logical Framework (Results Framework), Assumptions and Risks, and planned project budget.

- Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?
- Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
- Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
- Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- Were the project assumptions and risks well articulated in the PIF and Project Document?

The Evaluation should also provide an assessment of the project assumptions and risks as set out in the Project Document and Log Frame, including:

- Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs?
- Were externalities, (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc), that are relevant to the findings taken into account?

4.2 Project Implementation

The evaluation will assess the quality of:

- Implementing agency (**IA**) and executing agency (**EA**) supervision and support,
- The monitoring and evaluation (**M&E**) programme put in place and its use (including use of GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools),
- The depth of **stakeholder participation** and support
- How the project adapted to socio-economic and environmental changes that altered the basis for initial outputs and activities (**adaptive management**).

IA & EA execution

The evaluator should assess and **rate** the quality of Implementing Agency and Executing Agency service delivery.

- Was there an appropriate focus on results by the implementing and executing agencies?
- Was IA & EA supervision adequate?
- The quality of risk management
- Were managing parties responsive to significant implementation problems (if any)

- Was quality technical support provided in a timely manner to the project team?
- Is there candor and realism in supervision reporting?
- Was the chosen executing agency for project execution suitable, given the project design?

Monitoring and evaluation

An assessment and rating of the project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan design and implementation is required. The evaluation team should provide an M&E assessment that considers:

- Is the M&E plan well conceived?
- Is it articulated sufficient to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?
- Were baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities well articulated at project start-up.
- Was the M&E Plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?
- Are there indicators provided in the Project Document and were they effectively used for measuring progress and performance?
- Were progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedules complied with, including the timely delivery of well-developed monitoring reports (PIRs)?
- Were follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, taken in response to monitoring reports (PIRs)?
- Were PIR self-evaluation ratings consistent with the MTE and TE findings? If not, were these discrepancies identified by the project steering committee and addressed?
- Were changes made to project implementation as a result of the recommendations from the Midterm review?

Adaptive Management

The evaluation team should take note whether there were changes in the environmental and development objectives of the project during implementation, why these changes were made and what was the approval process.

- If changes in planned project outputs and activities were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes?
- Were the changes brought on due to weaknesses in the initial project conception or due to changes in the social, political and/or environmental circumstances in the project area?
- Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?

Stakeholders

The evaluation should include findings on the role and involvement of key project stakeholders. Questions regarding stakeholder participation include:

- Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and M&E? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?
- Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, non-governmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities?
- Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken

into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved?

4.3 Project Results

Project outcomes should be assessed against the ProDoc/Logical Framework, using focal area-specific indicators (See project LogFrame). The evaluation will rate the achievement of planned outcomes and provide an overall rating on the achievement of project results. When considering results, specific attention in the evaluation should be paid to: **country ownership, project finance, mainstreaming, sustainability and impact.**

Country Ownership

A critical aspect for all UNDP GEF projects is that they conform to country priorities. The evaluator should consider whether the project fits within stated sector development priorities, and also whether outputs (See project detailed Workplan) were developed with involvement from government officials and have been adopted into national strategies, policies and legal codes.

- Was the project concept in line with development priorities and plans of Haiti?
- Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?
- Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?
- Has the government enacted legislation and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project's objectives?

Project Finance

When considering achievement of results, special consideration must be given to the realization of **project financial goals**. The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. The evaluation team is expected to assess the following:

- Is there sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources?
- Have the reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing been made clear and are the reasons compelling?
- Was externally funded project components well integrated into the GEF supported components?
- Did the extent of materialization of co-financing have an effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability?
- Is there evidence of additional (to the originally committed) leveraged resources that have been committed as a result of the project? (leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector).

Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

Mainstreaming

UNDP/GEF projects are key components in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should conform to UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required outcomes focused primarily towards global environmental benefit. The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project successfully mainstreamed other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender balance.

- Is it possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations? (e.g. income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability).
- Do the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) country programme action plan (CPAP), and UN Development Assistance framework (UNDAF)?
- Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?
- Have gender issues been taken into account in project design and implementation, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc)? If so, how and to what extent?

Sustainability

The evaluators are required at a minimum to assess and rate the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, taking into account **financial, sociopolitical, institutional and environmental risks**.

- Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?
- Has a mechanism been installed to ensure financial and economic sustainability once GEF assistance ends?
- Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?
- What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
- Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow?

¹ Both UNDP and GEF are focusing greater attention to ensure that gender issues are taken into account in project formulation and implementation, (see UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2011).

² Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, 3.3 para. 19, page pp.9-10

- Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
- Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?

Impact

The evaluators should provide a narrative discussion on the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

4.4 Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**.

Conclusions

- Must be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to the evaluation findings. They should respond to the key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users.

Recommendations

- Should be practical, feasible and focused on actions and decisions to take. The recommendations should build from the evidence provided in the report, and should clearly specify the targeted audience for each recommendation (GEF, UNDP, Government of Haiti).

Lessons learned

- As appropriate, the evaluators should discuss lessons learned from the evaluation of relevance to UNDP and GEF for future projects. In particular, examples of best practices should be noted, so they can be replicated.

5. Evaluation approach and method

An indicative evaluation approach is provided here, however the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by UNEG). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation will take place mainly in Port-au-Prince. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, the National Project Manager, Steering Committee, project team, and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Port-au-Prince. The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP CO, PMU, OFP, MARNDR, MoE, CNIGS, other key project partners.

The evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual Reports, project budget revision, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. The list of documentation to be reviewed is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference;

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on: **documentation, interviews, field visits and questionnaires.**

Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data can be included with approval, and budget permitting.

6. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Haiti. UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. The consultant works under the supervision of the Head of the UNDP CO Environment and Energy Unit.

7. Evaluation deliverables

The consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs:

1. An Inception Report to be discussed with the UNDP CO, UNDP RTA and the Project Team, which indicates how this TOR will be implemented and includes specifics on the evaluation approach and details on the evaluation mission.
2. An oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation to UNDP CO, Project Team and county focal point(s) before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of the evaluation
3. The key product expected from this terminal evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report (in English and in French) that should, at least, include the contents as indicated in Annex 5 of this TOR. The Report of the Terminal Evaluation will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. It will be reviewed by the UNDP CO, Project Team, and UNDP RTA and then finalized.

The Report length shall not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

8. Evaluation report review process

Once the evaluation team provides the draft final evaluation report to the CO, the CO, RTA and project team will review the draft to check for errors and omissions of fact, and to ensure the draft evaluation report covers all aspects set out in this ToR and UNDP/GEF guidance. The CO and RTA may also offer additional information that they believe is relevant to the evaluation team's assessment of results, however it is recognized that as an independent evaluation, it is the prerogative of the evaluation team to offer their performance ratings, conclusions and recommendations.

The CO will consolidate comments to the draft final evaluation and send them to the evaluation team. The evaluation team is required to take all comments into consideration. The evaluation team will provide an 'audit trail' indicating how received comments have (or have not) been addressed in the revised evaluation report. The evaluation team should provide this audit trail when it submits the final evaluation report to the CO. The CO will then circulate the revised draft evaluation report for wider circulation to the OFP and to executing agencies and or/partner agencies, and to other stakeholders.

The final evaluation report is considered complete, in contractual terms, only when all aspects set out in this ToR have been fully covered and all comments to the draft evaluation report have been taken into account. The CO and RTA will then sign a clearance form to demonstrate their approval of the terminal evaluation report and this clearance form will be attached to the terminal evaluation report (see Annex 6).

9. Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 16 days according to the following plan:

Preparation before field work: 3 days

- Review the project document and other relevant information about the project (PIRs, TPR reports, Midterm Review report and other reports, etc);
- Review the overall development situation of the country (based on the UNDP Common Country Assessment and other available reports).
- Hold an initial telephone discussion with the UNDP RTA
- Prepare an Inception Report with a detailed mission programme, including comments on the TOR and the evaluation methodology to be followed.

Evaluation Mission: 7 days

- Meet with the UNDP CO team, the national GEF focal point(s) and other key stakeholders in country.
- Review all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Observe and review completed and ongoing field activities, (capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
- Interview key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

Draft Evaluation Report: 5 days

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP RTA and Project team.
- Draft terminal evaluation report in accordance with guidelines.
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO and UNDP RTA
- Complete the draft report and present the draft report for comments and suggestions within 3 weeks after the Evaluation mission.
- Optional stakeholder meeting towards the conclusion of the report drafting period, to present findings and initial conclusions and recommendations, and take comments from stakeholders.

Final Report: 1 day

- Presentation of final evaluation report to UNDP CO within 2 weeks of receiving reviewer comments.

10. Evaluation Consultant

An expert consultant will conduct the evaluation. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former cooperation with GEF is an advantage. The consultant is responsible for the technical dimension of the project evaluation as well as the managerial and administrative dimension of the project evaluation.

11. Consultant Qualities:

- Master's degree or higher in Sustainable Land Management (SLM) related field and/or Business Administration, management or a relevant field
- 5 years of recent experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- 3 years of experience with SLM or related field
- 5 years experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;

- 3 years experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Competence in Adaptive Management
- Knowledge of English and French; Knowledge of Haitian Creole would be an asset
- Awareness of the Haitian political/institutional context is a plus

12. Evaluator Ethics

The evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex 4) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations' and the UNDG Code of Conduct

Evaluator:

- Must be independent of any organization that was involved in the formulation and implementation of the project.
- May discuss the project with the authorities concerned, on all matters relevant to its assignment, but are not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.
- Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage.
- Must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.
- Are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- Sometimes can uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluations.
- Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholder's dignity and self worth.
- In line with the Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality.
- Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation

13. Payment modalities and specifications

Payment for evaluation services will be as follows: 10% at contract signing, 40% following submission and approval of the first draft of the terminal evaluation report; and the remaining 50% once the final report has been completed and cleared by the UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA.

14. Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://www.ht.undp.org/public/emplois.php?> by **November 28, 2011**. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English or in French with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply. UNDP is a non-smoking work environment.

Annex 1: Project Logical Framework

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Goal: To contribute to global benefits through the promotion of SLM initiatives that will enhance and maintain ecosystem productivity and ecological functions through capacity building in and the mainstreaming of SLM.					
Objective of the Project: <i>To contribute to reversing land degradation trends through the creation of an enabling environment for SLM by developing capacities within appropriate government and civil society institutions/user groups and through mainstreaming SLM considerations into government planning processes in Haiti</i>	National Development Plans pay adequate attention to SLM	National development plans do not prioritize SLM issues	SLM is understood as a main driver of socio-economic development and prioritized in national development plans by senior decision makers	National and sectoral development plans approved by relevant agencies	Continued political support for integrating SLM into national development planning
	60-80% of senior decision-makers in all sectors are aware of the importance of LD	Senior decision-makers are not committed to SLM issues		Records of the Official Gazette "Le Moniteur"	The socio-political situation in Haiti remains stable
	NGOs and CSOs are active and effective at some levels in promoting SLM	Few NGOs and CBOs promote SLM but efforts are isolated and fragmented	NGOs & CBOs trained in SLM issues/options, and actively disseminating these	Mandatory Surveys	All relevant productive sectors, as well as government authorities understand, and remain committed, to prioritizing SLM issues and options
	Productivity and sustainability of upland farming by adopting SLM in a pilot area improved	0 ha	Pilot area of 200 ha under improved farming practices	Project progress reports Evaluation Reports GIS	
Outcome 1: SLM principles are mainstreamed into national policies, plans and legislation	NAP formulated and approved	NAP does not exist.	UNCCD NAP completed by Y1	Decisions on NAP approved by the Parliament. Norms and regulations published in the Official Gazette "Le Moniteur"; review reports	Government agencies willing to allocate funds for NAP implementation
	Annual NAP monitoring/review process has been put in place	No NAP monitoring	NAP reviewed on a yearly basis	Publications in the Official Gazette "Le Moniteur"	Authorities and planners are motivated and see the advantage of SLM in sustainable development.
	Relevant policies contain specific sections on and follow principles of SLM	SLM considerations are not reflected in sector policies; sectoral policy documents that address some desertification issues under development, but fragmented	Sectoral policy documents including the national water policy, policy of the Ministry of Agriculture for watershed management, and a disaster and hazards management national plan updated and harmonized	Project progress reports	Government agencies are willing to allocate adequate budgetary funds in support of SLM as a result of continued political support for SLM
	Environmental management regulatory and policy framework is updated and harmonized in support of SLM options and considerations	New Decree for Environmental Management issued in 2005 does not fully incorporate SLM considerations	New decree for Environmental Management updated and provides for harmonized land and water resource management	Evaluation reports	

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Outcome 2: Capacity building for SLM is enhanced	Number of professionals in the principal national and local agencies responsible for environment and lands qualified to deal with SLM	Staff at relevant government agencies is inadequately trained in SLM.	50% of staff from MoE, MARNDR, MPCE and MICT actively engaged in promoting SLM;	Visit to relevant departments and field sites.	NRSC makes imagery available to all institutions with LIS capability
	Training programmes and awareness raising programmes for local communities are being implemented in a financially sustainable manner and cover a range of technical requirements and alternative practices	SLM options are not practiced by rural communities which have poor capacity; training programs are developed covering various technical requirements by bi-lateral agencies and other donors, but do not necessarily promote SLM options in a comprehensive manner	10 national level officers and 20 departmental level officers trained by mid term	Training and workshop reports and training material	Local and national planning bodies are committed to the integration of SLM considerations into development planning
	Number of staff trained in GIS and land information systems	Training in GIS limited to one or two specialized agencies; use of GIS in planning poorly understood	30 community groups in 15 villages trained in SLM practices by Y3 as model for upscaling	Mid Term Review	GoH remains committed to direct participation of CBOs and NGOs in natural resource management
	An effective inter-sectoral mechanism for SLM meets regularly and is effective and is sustainable	Comité Interinstitutionnel de Pilotage exists but has not yet effectively tackled SLM issues	10 staff each in MoE, MADRNR, and MPCE trained in GIS	Mandatory surveys	
			CIP is fully functional with informed members and strong participation, and actively promoting SLM principles	GIS	
				CIP Meeting reports	
Outcome 3: Capacities for knowledge and awareness for SLM strategies and options are developed	Innovative tools for SLM such as land functionality analysis (land-use planning), integrated assessment and Land information systems have been adapted to local and national needs, and are functional in places	There is little understanding of these planning tools, and no LIS exists	Detailed sustainability of land use report prepared for pilot area, that can be upscaled	Land use report	
	100% of agricultural and forest land uses in the pilot area have been digitized and are integrated into a computerized land information system.	Information on land use and land degradation is very fragmented.	Guidelines for LIS prepared	Guidelines on LIS	Institutions willing to collaborate on integrated approaches to sustainable land management and to share access to land information.
	Information on land ownership and rights including public and private lands and protected areas in a pilot area are developed and	Land ownership and rights not well defined	Information on land use and land degradation in pilot area completed by Y2.	Mandatory surveys	Project progress reports
		Computerized land information system does not exist.	Pilot land rights and ownership study completed by Y2	Medium and final evaluation	
			Computerized land use data base and	LIS reports	
				Study on land rights and ownership in pilot area	
				Records of MoE and MARNDR agency meetings	Government commits the resources necessary for knowledge management activities

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
	<p>utilized for land use planning</p> <p>At least 3 project proposals and/or programs on forest conservation and sustainable farming practices formulated by MoE and MARNDR is using the information generated by the MSP</p>	<p>The impact of fuel wood harvesting on watersheds not fully understood; intensification of upland agriculture is planned without adequate consideration for SLM</p>	<p>information system completed by Y3 and available to relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Studies on impact of fuel wood harvesting on watersheds completed by MT; of sustainable upland farming system completed by Y2</p> <p>3 project proposals or programs developed and under implementation</p>		<p>including digitizing the land survey/ownership records and SLM monitoring and planning.</p>
Outcome 4: Mobilization of Resources is improved	<p>Completed Medium Term Investment Plan</p> <p>Financing for MTIP established including from international partners</p> <p>MTIP monitoring and review system in place</p>	<p>No MTIP exists</p> <p>Donor interest in funding projects that address the issue of land degradation exist, and targeted projects under development in some regions of Haiti</p> <p>No MTIP monitoring</p>	<p>Completed MTIP, based on SLM principles, and supported by key relevant agencies</p> <p>Donor meeting held and their commitment documented by Y3 for 70% of MTIP priorities</p> <p>80% of financing for MTIP committed</p> <p>MTIP reviewed yearly</p>	<p>Investment plan (document)</p> <p>Minutes of meetings/conferences</p> <p>Records of donor meetings</p> <p>MTIP review documents</p>	<p>Political stability in Haiti is maintained and donors are willing to commit to supporting initiatives</p>
Outcome 5: Adaptive management and learning	<p>Project Management Unit established and effective</p> <p>Project implementation guided by monitoring and evaluation program</p> <p>Documented lessons from project implementation</p>	<p>No project</p>	<p>Project Outputs and targets achieved</p> <p>All required project monitoring reports prepared</p> <p>Lessons learnt documentation incorporated into annual progress report</p>	<p>Annual project progress reports</p> <p>Annual workplans</p> <p>Quarterly Operational and Annual project progress reports;</p> <p>Published annual M+E evaluations;</p> <p>Revised Annual work plans</p> <p>Audit documents</p>	<p>Institutional capacity exists</p>

Annex 2: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

1. Validation workshop reports
2. Training workshop reports
3. Sustainable Land Management Guidelines;
4. Analysis of the legal and institutional framework related to Sustainable Land Management;
5. Inventory of Land Use Information systems in Haiti;
6. Report on the Primary approaches on the sustainability of agro-forestry systems in dry-lands : Case of Prosopis exploitation in Bainet (Southeastern Haiti);
7. National Action Program for Combating Desertification;
8. Domestication of Azadirachta indica (Neem) and other ligneous tree species in the southern peninsula of Haiti
9. Analysis of the sustainability and the productivity of mountainous agriculture in Haiti
10. Inventory of land use and land degradation in Haiti
11. Assessment of the impacts of fuelwood overexploitation in Haiti
12. Analysis of land tenure system and property rights in relation to sustainable land management in Haiti
13. Harmonization of the Legal, Regulatory and Institutional Framework Related to Sustainable Land Management
14. Project Document
15. Project Progress Reports
16. Minutes from relevant meetings
17. APR/PIR reports
18. Annual work plans

Annex 3: Evaluation Rating Scales

12. Ratings Scales		
<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></p> <p>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5. Satisfactory (S): minor</p> <p>4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings:</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

Annex 4: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on

Signature: _____

³ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex 5: Evaluation Report Outline

- i. Opening page:
 - Name of the UNDP/GEF project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency and project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Brief description of the project
 - Context and purpose of the evaluation
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁴)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Key issues addressed
 - Methodology of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project seeks to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation (*)
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ Using a six-point rating scale: 6:Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Financial Planning
- Monitoring and evaluation: design and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Executing Agency execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Catalytic Role & Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex 6: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by CO and RCU and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP- GEF- RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____