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Annex 1: Terms of Reference

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in the Dominican Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS Project ID</td>
<td>00047486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMS Number</td>
<td>3411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal Area</td>
<td>Land Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
<td>An improved system, institutional and individual capacity to coordinate, implement, sustain and evaluate sustainable land management options to reverse desertification and land degradation processes in the Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project start-date</td>
<td>20 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Budget (US $)</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing (US $)</td>
<td>832,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project closing date</td>
<td>30 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation Date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. BACKGROUND

UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy of UNDP/GEF projects has four objectives:

- Carry out monitoring and evaluation of the results and impacts of the project;
- Provide information for decision making and the implementation of whatever change or improvements that are deemed necessary;
- Promote responsibility in the use of resources’
- Document, provide feedback and disseminate lessons learned.

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.

To ensure the effectiveness of the M & E of projects, a series of tools are used during the life of the project, e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, mid-term evaluations, audit reports and final evaluations.

These Terms of Reference correspond to the Terminal Evaluation of the project “Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in the Dominican Republic. For more details about the content and methodology of the evaluation, please refer to the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects (version for Evaluation Team).

Brief description of project:

The sustainability of agricultural production and rural life and the integrity of ecosystems in the Dominican Republic are seriously affected by land degradation. It was felt that a project funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) was necessary to develop a long-term proposal for sustainable land management through the development of system-level capabilities, and individual and institutional mainstreaming efforts between agencies, NGOs and the private sector to share responsibility for sustainable land management. The GEF increment was also necessary to provide expert support and tools necessary to define the path and methodologies necessary for the establishment of a quantified baseline and to permit the long-term monitoring of land degradation and to develop awareness and funding needed to ensure long-term monitoring and an intersectoral and interagency cost-effective approach for Sustainable Land Management (SLM).

The long-term goal of the project is to promote the adoption of sustainable land management initiatives in the Dominican Republic to increase the health, stability, integrity, ecosystem functions and services while at the same time improving sustainable livelihoods. The project objective is to improve the systemic, institutional and individual capacity to coordinate, implement, maintain and evaluate SLM options to reverse the processes of desertification and land degradation in the Dominican Republic. This would be achieved through training to implement a strategy in the Dominican Republic for the sustainable management of land and through mainstreaming SLM into the various levels of decision making.

The project has three outcomes:

a) Mainstreaming of SLM principles and priorities of the PAN (National Action Program) into national policies, programs and plans in line to achieve the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals);

b) Systematic, institutional and individual capacity developed for SLM; and
c) Resource mobilization strengthened to support SLM activities.

The project was implemented over a period of three years. The total project cost is U.S. $ 1,332,450.

The implementing agency of the project is the UNDP Office in the Dominican Republic. The executing agency is the Government of the Dominican Republic through the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. In its capacity as executing agency, the Ministry, through the Vice Ministry of Land and Water, is responsible for project management, achieving the immediate objectives and expected outputs, making efficient and effective use of the resources and ensuring effective coordination between the project and other projects in the country related to land degradation and sustainable land management.

2) OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) will be carried out in accordance with the guidelines, regulations and procedures of UNDP and GEF as reflected in the Guidelines for GEF Project Evaluations (Appendix 1). A rigorous analysis and strong documentation are key to the quality of the evaluation.

The TE is intended to evaluate the implementation of the project, review the achievements of the project in meeting the objective and expected results thereof, assess the project design, establish the importance, performance, relevance, implementation and success of the project, look for evidence of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the project’s contribution to capacity building and the achievement of global environmental goals. These assessments will also seek to identify and document lessons learned, and make any recommendations that may improve the design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects and other agencies and countries.

The main actors involved in this evaluation are:

- Project Management
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
- Local governments (municipalities)
- NGOs
- Vice Ministry of Land and Water, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Planning Department of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Vice Ministry of Forests, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Vice Ministry of Environmental Education and Information, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Land Use Department and Aggregate Management, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- National Institute of Hydraulic Resources (INDRHI)
- Ministry of Agriculture
- National Meteorological Office
3) SPECIAL ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

The final document must be submitted in English. Drafts should be circulated in Spanish.

4) SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation will be based on the application of the five main criteria defined by the CAD/OCDE, which are relevance, and the effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability. These criteria will be defined through a series of questions that should cover the following three aspects of the project:

a) Concept and design aspects of the project including the Logical Framework, Assumptions, Risks, Budget, Co-financing and appropriateness of the timing

b) Project Implementation: Support and supervision of executing/implementing agencies, monitoring and evaluation (including Tracking Tools), participation of stakeholders; adaptive management.

c) Result: Effects, Impacts, catalytic effect, sustainability, mainstreaming of other UNDP priorities such as support programs as defined in the UNDAF and CPAP, and cross-cutting issues such as gender and South-South collaboration.

This includes the assessment (ranking) of the project using the categories of Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory and Highly Unsatisfactory (see Guidelines for GEF Project Evaluations).

The evaluation will have to answer the following key questions:

1. How does the project support GEF’s strategic priorities and the environmental and sustainable development priorities of the Dominican Republic?

2. To what extent have the objectives and results of the project been achieved?

3. How have external factors influenced project performance?

4. Were the financial resources used efficiently?

5. Is the national capacity adequate to ensure the sustainability of the results achieved by the project?

5) EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF THE EVALUATION

There are three expected outputs of this evaluation:

1. An inception report (as described in the Guidelines for Project Evaluations GEF, Annex).

2. An oral presentation of preliminary findings to UNDP - Dominican Republic and the Project Team.

3. A final report with inputs from stakeholders.

The evaluation report should be based on the GEF guidelines for evaluation and will be structured along the lines reflected in the Guidelines for GEF Project Evaluations (see Appendix).
6) METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology to be applied must follow the guidelines established in the Evaluation Guide. The main written sources of information for this assessment are:

- Project Document (PRODOC)
- Project Progress Reports
- Project Budget
- Project Work Plans
- List and contact details of project staff and other interest group related to the project
- Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- External audit report
- Communication materials on the project: publications, brochures, etc.
- Project outputs
- Planning documents UNDP (UNDAF, CPD, CPAP)
- National legislation relevant to the project and any other material that may be considered useful

It is recommended that the evaluator presents the proposed methodology for conducting the evaluation in the inception report, which will be discussed with UNDP-Dominican Republic and the Project Coordination Unit to create a balance of written information, interviews and field visits.

7) PROFILE OF EVALUATOR

An independent consultant will carry out the final evaluation of the project. The evaluator should have a wide range of skills and knowledge - analytical expertise and experience in project evaluation, technical skills related to sustainable land management, environmental matters and experience with social and economic development issues, and of the links of these with the public policy cycle in the environmental sector. Evaluators should also have updated familiarity with GEF strategies and policies.

The consultant in charge of the evaluation will be responsible for submitting the Evaluation Report. As such, (s)he will define the methodology and the timing of the inputs for the report and final revisions.

To achieve the objectives of the assessment, the consultant is required to align his/her work with the rules of ethics to which reference is made in the guide and to sign the Code of Conduct attached as Annex 2.

The consultant will be responsible for:

- Evaluating the design of the project, its relevance and progress towards the objectives that were established.

- Evaluating the various aspects of the project such as sustainability, ownership, monitoring and evaluation, efficiency, impact, financial sustainability and institutional capacity, among others.
• Evaluating the implementation capacity of the various bodies involved, carefully reviewing the ability to carry out their specific responsibilities.

• Assess how the different bodies interacted with each and how they maintained a clear definition of roles and responsibilities.

• Evaluating management issues, financial and project administration.

• Evaluating compliance with the rules and procedures of the administrative, and financial system and project reports, verifying that they conform with the financial rules and regulations of UNDP and GEF, and public procurement rules when applicable.

• Preparing the final report.

Required profile:

• Formal education and graduate-level training in areas related to development with emphasis on sustainable land management or related areas.

• At least 5 years of specific experience in the design, implementation, monitoring and / or evaluation of projects of similar magnitude and complexity. Preference will be given to consultants familiar with projects to combat land degradation.

• Knowledge of the administrative, managerial and reporting system of project similar in theme, scale and complexity.

• Preference will be given to consultants with knowledge of monitoring and evaluation of projects implemented by the GEF and / or UNDP.

• Mastery of the logical framework methodology.

• Knowledge of government, private and nongovernmental organizations related to the environmental, natural resource conservation and / or land management sector.

• Communication skills and coordination of evaluation activities for similar projects.

• Basic knowledge of financial rules and regulations of UNDP and GEF is desirable.

• Fluency in English and Spanish.

• Ensure the independence of the evaluation. The consultant hired must be free of potential conflict of interest with the institutions that are executing or co-executing the project.

• Ability to work under pressure and meet tight deadlines.

• Excellent writing skills.

8) IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE EVALUATION

The TE is a requirement of the UNDP / GEF projects, and therefore it is the UNDP Dominican Republic Office, as the Implementation Agency, that initiated the consultancy and has overall responsibility for coordinating the
evaluation, along with ensuring the timely delivery of contract payments. The UNDP Country Office will carry out the necessary coordination for interviews with key contacts and organization of the field mission. The evaluator, at the beginning of the mission, will participate in a meeting / briefing with the Country Office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU).

Payment arrangements and specifications: The evaluators will be hired by UNDP. The payment schedule is as follows:

• Operating expenses (airfare, travel and other operational costs): the beginning of the consultancy;

• 15% of fees: upon receipt and approval of inception report;

• 35% of fees: upon submission and approval of the first draft to the UNDP-Dominican Republic;

• The remaining 50% of the fees: paid once the final report has been completed and approved by the UNDP-RD and UNDP / GEF-RCU. The quality of the final report will be evaluated by the UNDP-RD and UNDP / GEF-RCU. If the quality of the report does not meet the standards or requirements of the UNDP / GEF, the evaluator will be asked to rewrite or revise the document (as many times as necessary) before the last payment is issued.

Duration and deadlines: The final evaluation of the project will take an estimated 18 days of work over a period of two months.

The evaluator must:

• Review the documentation provided and submit the inception report of the evaluation. This documentation includes background information and project design documents. Read and analyze quarterly reports and minutes, reports and minutes of meetings, reports of internal and external audits, etc. (5 days).

• After reviewing the project documentation, the evaluator will travel to continue the evaluation work. The timetable for the remainder of the work should be set and the evaluator will visit the institutions involved and interview selected people (5 days).

• Validation of preliminary findings with the Ministry of Environment, the Office of the UNDP-DR and co-executors (through a verbal presentation of general impressions).

• Preparation and circulation of the draft report for comments from interested parties - UNDP-RD, UNDP / GEF RCU and Ministry of Environment (6 days). There will be a 15-day period for interested parties to review the report and send comments to the evaluator. These comments will focus particularly on possible errors in data included in the report but will not question the evaluator’s impressions. If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders, these will be included in an appendix in the final report.

• Final review of the report including comments from stakeholders and team members (two days).

9) QUESTIONS, EVALUATION AND EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

Questions about Terms of Reference: Questions to clarify the TORs and about the nature and scope of the work or other aspects related to this call can be made by email to: centro.servicios@undp.org

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposals: The evaluation of proposals will include a process consisting of two stages in which the professional profile of the candidate is evaluated prior to the review of the financial proposal. The
economic proposal will only be considered for proponents exceeding the minimum score of 70% of the total score of 70 points for the evaluation of the professional profile.

The financial proposal will have a weighting of 30 points, awarding the top score to the most economical proposal and giving a score to the others based on the following formula: (most economic tender / Bid evaluation) x30.

The contract will be awarded to the proposal with the highest combined score: Professional profile (70) + Financial Offer (30).

Presentation of CV and Financial Proposal: The proponent’s resume, completed P11 form, and a financial proposal (including fees and operating costs, airfare, per diems, lodging, national transfers) must be sent physically or electronically, with a cover letter, no later than Friday, June 22, 2012, at 2:00 pm to any of the following addresses:

In hard copy:

United Nations House, Anacaona Avenue # 9, Mirador Sur, Santo Domingo, DR

In electronic copy:

Centro.servicios @ undp.org

Note: This tender process is aimed at professionals, who shall serve individually.

**10) ANNEXES**

Annex 1: Guide for Evaluation of GEF Projects

Annex 2: Code of Conduct (to be signed)
### Annex 2: Logical Framework

**Goal:** To ensure ecosystem health, stability, integrity, functions and the continuity of ecosystem services that support global benefits and sustainable livelihoods in the Dominican Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective of the project:</strong> an improved system, institutional, and individual capacity to coordinate, implement, sustain, and evaluate Sustainable Land Management in response to land degradation problems in the Dominican Republic.</td>
<td>Overall change in status of 37 compulsory indicators as measured by the M+E Toolkit for LDC/SIDS portfolio project.</td>
<td>To be measured at inception</td>
<td>Toolkit results reported to RTA and GSU following baseline and updated on July 1 of each year.</td>
<td>Government and key stakeholders are increasingly aware of the impacts of land degradation on national development objectives and provide enhanced support for SLM options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 1:** SLM mainstreamed into national development policies, programs, and plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical increase in Awareness on land degradation issues and effects on the national economy and on poverty reduction.</td>
<td>Low level of awareness. Level (category) to be documented during the inception phase of the project through a baseline Awareness Survey.</td>
<td>High level of awareness (&gt;80%) of respondees to Awareness Survey by GO and NGO partners and 50% of general public demonstrate awareness by the end of the project.</td>
<td>Results of awareness survey at the national level with stratification at the ministry level taken twice at inception and final phase of project.</td>
<td>Motivation by government authorities will not change with changes in political administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of institutions with investment plans to execute actions in support of land degradation | 0 Institutions | | | |

| Institutions: SEMARN and under-secretariats of Forestry, Soils and Water, |

| Budget to support the sub-directorate. | | | | |

| Motivation by government authorities will not change with changes in political administration |

<p>| Awareness messages by media and other agencies have a positive effect on motivating policy and planning authorities to facilitate the process of integration of SLM into sustainable | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives Oriented to NAP</th>
<th>SEA INDRH Public Works NGOs (collective). Municipalities (collective).</th>
<th>Development plans and strategies. Senior policy and planning authorities are motivated to facilitate the progress of integration of SLM into sustainable plans and strategies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congressional approval of the NAP</td>
<td>Unapproved NAP document soon to be approved by Presidential decree. Approval as either a congressional resolution or as a law. Published act in the National Registry.</td>
<td>High level of cooperation from related Secretariats and sectors to participate and sustain participation in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2:</strong> System, Institution and Individual-level capacities to implement SLM and the NAP developed.</td>
<td>The number of municipalities reporting land degradation issues, actions, and investments from the municipal levels to SEMARN/SWS</td>
<td>The GTI effectively executes bi-annual workplans for NAP implementation. The number of Secretariats that receive timely reports from SEMARN for inclusion in PRSP, PND, and MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Municipalities reporting</td>
<td>0 workplans with 0 level of execution. 1 workplan approved by members every 2 years and executed to 80% of programmed activities within 3 months of established targets. Reports to members. GTZ Technical audits of performance and final evaluation of institutional strengthening initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% of Municipalities by the end of 2009 and 80% by the end of 2010. Yearly scorecard maintained by SEMARN/SWS. Formal communications on results to GTI and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Staff turn-over rates will not affect personnel trained in SLM through the project. Multiple institutions will be willing to share information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project mid-term and final evaluations include inputs from the listed agencies on the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3: Resource mobilization to support Sustainable Land Management.</td>
<td>Proposal to measure baseline and future monitoring of national indicators for land degradation, drought, and desertification is ratified by all institutions with named responsibilities.</td>
<td>0 proposals developed and ratified by 0 institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4: Effective project management through learning, evaluation, and adaptive management.</td>
<td>Lessons learned from project widely disseminated</td>
<td>0 evaluations to determine change in management systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>Outcome 4</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>Congressional environment committee.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment &amp; operation of Project Implementation Unit</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Unit is operational within 1 month of Project start-up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Itinerary

Sunday September 16
Travel from Ottawa, Canada to Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic

Monday, September 17
9:30 am: Interview with Ana Carolina Beras, Specialist in M&E, Environment & Energy Unit and with María Eugenia Morales, Program Official E&E
10:30 am: Interview with Pedro García Brito and Clara Fernández, PMU, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (henceforth referred to as Ministry of Environment)
12:00 pm: Interview with Patricia Abreu, GEF Operational Focal Point and Vice Ministry of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Environment
3:00 pm: Interview with Andrés Cedano, FAO

Tuesday, September 18
10:30: Interviews with Janina Segura, Josefina Violeta Morales-Payán and Gonzalo Morales, CEDAF (Centro de Desarrollo Agropecuario y Forestal)
2:00 pm: José Nova, CONIAF
3:00 pm: Ing. Brito, Director of Watersheds, Ministry of Environment

Wednesday, September 19
10:00 am: All morning working session with Pedro García, Ministry of Environment

Thursday, September 20
8:30 am: Students of diploma course and employees of Instituto Nacional de Recursos Hidráulicos (INDRHI)
9:30 am: Interview with Franklin Reynoso, Consultant for project (study on best practices) and current Deputy Director of INDRHI
10:30: Cirilo Marte, Consultant for project (micro-financing study)
11:30: Interview with Pablo Ovalles, Consultant for project (land degradation study)
2:30 Interview with Pedro Núñez, Consultant for project (National Strategy for SLM)
4:00 pm: Presentation of initial findings of Terminal Evaluation at UNDP to Resident Representative Roberto Gálvez, María Eugenia Morales, Ana Carolina Beras, and César Iván González, Monitoring and Evaluation Associate

**Friday, September 21**

9:00 am: Interview with Alberto Sánchez, UNDP-GEF Small Grants Program

10:00- 12:00: Interview with Ramón Pujols, Deputy Director of Extension, Ministry of Agriculture and with participants of diploma course and shorter training courses, Ministry of Agriculture
### Annex 4: List of stakeholders interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro García Brito</td>
<td>National Project Coordinator, Director of GTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Fernández</td>
<td>Project Technical/ Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés Cedano</td>
<td>Technical Official, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina Violeta Morales-Payán</td>
<td>Consultant with CEDAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramón Pujols Sánchez</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Department of Agricultural Extension and Training, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janina Segura</td>
<td>Training and Capacity Building, CEDAF (Centro para el Desarrollo Agropecuario y Forestal, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalo Morales</td>
<td>Publications and Audivisuals, CEDAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Pedro Ant. Núñez Ramos</td>
<td>Project Consultant, Researcher, Instituto Dominicano de Investigaciones Agropecuarias y Forestales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Eugenia Morales</td>
<td>Program Official, UNDP Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Carolina Beras</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, UNDP Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Milton Garcia</td>
<td>First Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Abreu</td>
<td>GEF Operational Focal Point and Vice-Minister of International Cooperation, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Brito</td>
<td>Director of Watersheds, Ministry of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Sanchez</td>
<td>Director of UNDP-GEF Small Grants Program for Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo Ovalles</td>
<td>Project consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Reynoso</td>
<td>Project consultant and current Director of Instituto Nacional de Recursos Hidráulicos (INDRHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirilo Marte</td>
<td>Project consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Guerrero</td>
<td>Head of Competitive Agriculture Unit, CONIAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Nova</td>
<td>Head of Environment and Natural Resources, CONIAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingeniera Cuella</td>
<td>CONIAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo Segura</td>
<td>INDRHI, Participant in diploma course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Bautista</td>
<td>INDRHI, Participant in diploma course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Amalis Romero</td>
<td>INDRHI, Participant in diploma course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Agrón. Andrés Lora</td>
<td>Director Proyecto Pimienta, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Agrón. José Cese Burgos</td>
<td>Technician for Proyecto Pimienta, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Agrón. Pedro González</td>
<td>Technician for Proyecto Pimienta, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lic. Ignacio Félix</td>
<td>Head of Rural Organization Department, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Agrón. Maria Polanco</td>
<td>Technician of Organic Agriculture Department, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licda. Digna Zorrilla</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Risk Management and Climate Change Department, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Agrón. Maria Descalsi</td>
<td>Head of Risk Management and Climate Change Division, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Civil Juana de la Rosa</td>
<td>Head of Risk and Climate Change Division, Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solángel González</td>
<td>Agro-meteorology, Organización Nacional de Meteorología (ONAMET)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: List of Documents Reviewed

CEDAF. Informe Final Diplomado en Control y Prevención de la Desertificación como herramienta de adaptación al Cambio Climático. 26 January 2012


Contreras, Mario R. Estudio de las Microfinanzas como Fuente de Financiamiento en el Manejo Sostenible de Tierras en República Dominicana.

Francisco y Asociados, Reportes de los Contadores Públicos Independientes, Proyecto de desarrollo de capacidades para el manejo sostenible de la tierra en la República Dominicana, 31 December 2010

Government of the Dominican Republic. Ley No. 1-12 que establece la Estrategia Nacional de Desarrollo 2030


Ministerio Ambiente, CEDAF and CONIAF. Foro Permanente para el Manejo Sostenible de los Suelos (brochure).


Paula, Rafael. Recomendaciones de políticas para la gestión sostenible de los suelos en las regiones de desertificación de la República Dominicana: documento de posición. Agosto 2012

Paula, Rafael, Estudio Sobre el Nivel de Conocimiento de la Desertificación y la Sequía y el Grado de Satisfacción de Servicios Prestados para el Manejo Sostenible de Tierras en las Zonas de Desertificación de la República Dominicana. Informe final. June 2011.


PMU. Minutes of GTI meetings (only available for March 2010 and 12 January 2012)

PMU. Annual Work Plans
PMU. Trimestral progress reports (2008-2012)

PMU. Términos De Referencia: Evaluación del Estado de Presión de los Recursos Naturales en Cuatro Regiones de la República Dominicana”.

PMU. Términos De Referencia: “Estrategia Nacional para el Manejo Sostenible de los Suelos”-“Estrategia Nacional para el Manejo Sostenible de los Suelos”

PMU. Términos De Referencia: “Evaluación de las acciones, los mejores enfoques y lineamientos para la lucha contra la degradación de la tierra en la República Dominicana”

PMU. Términos De Referencia: “Elaboración documento sobre recomendaciones de políticas sobre gestión sostenible de los suelos en República Dominicana”-

PMU. Términos De Referencia: Edición del documento “Módulo Educativo Dinámicas de Ecosistemas en Zonas Áridas”-
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Annex 6: Questionnaire used

Note that the consultant prepared specific questions tailored to each particular stakeholder based on this general list.

1. Project Formulation

- How relevant is the project and its objectives to Belize’s national priorities?
- Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and realistic within its time frame?
- To what extent did stakeholders participate in the project design process?
- Were the capacities of the executing institution 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 Project Document?

2. Project Results and Impact

- Please comment on the level of achievement of each of the main indicators/targets as established in the logical framework.
- What do you consider to be the project’s main achievements?
- What were the project’s main limitations?

3. Sustainability

- Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?
- Is there sufficient stakeholder awareness and ownership in support of the project’s long-term objectives?
- 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?
- 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?

4. Project Implementation

- How effectively did the PMU/PCPU manage the project?
- Please comment on the executing modality for this project.
- Can you comment on the performance of UNDP as Implementing Agency?
• Was there an appropriate focus on results by the implementing and executing agencies?
• Please comment on the quality of risk management
• Were managing parties responsive to significant implementation problems (if any)?
• Was the chosen executing agency for project execution suitable, given the project design?

5. Monitoring and evaluation
• Please comment on the adequacy of the M&E plan and the logical framework.
• 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?
• Were the indicators provided in the Project Document effectively used to measure 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, why not?
• How effective was the PEG in monitoring project progress and keeping the project on track?

6. Adaptive Management
• Were there any changes in planned project outputs and activities? If so, did they have a significant impact on the expected project outcomes?
• Why were the changes brought on? (e.g., due to weaknesses in the initial project design or due to changes in the social, political and/or environmental circumstances in the project area)?
• Were the project’s changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?

7. Stakeholders
• Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and M&E?
• 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?

8. Country Ownership
• Please comment on the level of national ownership of this project.
• Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?
• Has the government enacted legislation and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project’s objectives?

9. Project Finance

• Is there sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources?
• Were there significant differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing and if so, what were the reasons for these differences?
• Were 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?
• Were there additional leveraged resources committed during project implementation?

10. Mainstreaming

• Did the project have any positive or negative effects of the project on local populations and on livelihoods?
• Have gender issues been taken into account in project design and implementation? If so, how and to what extent?
• Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?
• 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)?

11. Lessons Learned and Recommendations

• Please comment on any lessons learned as a result of this project.
• Please comment on best practices.
• Please provide recommendations for future projects based on this experience.
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