Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)
UNDP Outcome Evaluation
Recovery Programme 2010-2012

1. Background and Context

Since the devastating earthquake of 12 January 2010, enormous efforts have been made to help the government achieve its objectives and to improve Haitians' living conditions.

The aftermath of the earthquake that killed more than 200 000 people, damaged or destroyed more than 300,000 buildings and left 1.5 million people displaced, is still visible in the capital and surrounding areas. In addition, in 2012, Haiti was hit by the passage of Hurricane Sandy, which caused casualties and considerable damage, especially in the agricultural sector.

Haiti is however changing, Haiti is striding forward. The results of the reconstruction process are visible and Haitian women, who represent nearly half of the heads of families, are the daily valiant actresses and witnesses of these changes. The government, the private sector and international organizations are not the only driving forces behind the reconstruction process.

Families, communities and women are themselves at the forefront of collaborative efforts and play a key role in making communities and towns more resilient in Haiti. To respond to the UN priority for systematic integration of gender issues into its interventions, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) paid particular attention to the full integration of women's contributions in its work in 2012.

Today, 80% of the ten million cubic meters of debris generated by the earthquake have been cleared from the streets. The pace was much faster than that recorded in 2004 in Indonesia after the tsunami, or in New York after the events of 11 September 2001. A United Nations project headed by UNDP not only cleared one million cubic meters of debris but also managed to recycle the rubble and turn it into paving stones, stairs, corridors, houses and public places where families gather and children can play.

According to the last figures by the E-Shelter and CCM Cluster, the number of people living in camps has decreased from 1.5 million to 320,000 today. It is still much too much. But it does also mean that more than one million people have returned home over the last two years, and UNDP is proud to have contributed to these efforts alongside the Haitian Government and its partners through the 16 neighbourhoods/6 camps programme That allowed to 44,000 people living in 50 camps to return to their neighbours and to start again their life thanks also to the subsidies for housing solutions that they have received through the programme.

Neighbourhoods, roads and houses have been rehabilitated; and thousands of jobs have been created in low-income communities where the population suffers from chronic unemployment.

Women have accounted for over 40% of those employed, thereby revitalizing the local economy. Placing the Haitian people and their communities at the centre of the recovery process is the key to success. Within the neighbourhoods, community platforms have allowed community members to decide on the planning priorities for their neighbourhoods, not to mention the establishment of crucial infrastructure resistant to urban risks as a means of further strengthening the resilience of the communities.

While progress is visible and tangible, all kinds of massive challenges lie ahead for Haiti to recover and ensure long-term development. These challenges will only be overcome in partnerships, under the aegis of national authorities, with the commitment of the Haitian people and the continuing support of Haiti's international partners.

As UNDP Haiti comes to the end of this programming cycle, the office is now looking to assess the contribution of its recovery projects to the achievement of the expected outcome of improving living conditions of crisis affected population.

This outcome was established in UNDP Haiti's Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) which covers the period of 2009 to 2012. This Action Plan was established in line with the strategy detailed in the Country Programme Document (CPD) signed between UNDP Haiti and the Government of Haiti in 2008. This CPD reflects UNDP's contribution to the UN System programming document the "Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF)" for the same programming period of 2009 – 2012.

UNDP Haiti hopes that the recommendations of the evaluation will determine lessons learned and challenges in the area recovery programming and provide guidance for the new programming cycle 2013-2016.

2. Evaluation Purpose

This evaluation is intended to assess UNDP's contribution towards achieving the following outcome of the 2009 – 2012 CPAP.

"Living conditions of crisis affected population improved"

Given that the CO is particularly interested in evaluating the post-earthquake recovery phase, the evaluation should focus specifically on projects carried out in response to the January 12 2010 Earthquake from 2010 until the end of 2012. While UNDP provided a comprehensive response in many sectors, at this time UNDP is particularly interested to analyze the recovery efforts. As such, the evaluation should concentrate on the following components of this outcome:

1) Earthquake affected physical infrastructure rehabilitated

2) Livelihoods of affected population improved

In order to achieve these results, UNDP implemented(s) 9 projects between 2010 and 2012, whose collective results contribute to the achievement of results at output level and contribution to outcome level results stated above. These projects, principally related to Debris Management, Cash for Work and other Livelihoods activities, were implemented by UNDP in coordination with numerous governmental agencies, including: Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Public Works, the Ministry of Women's Affairs, the Ministry of Youth and the Ministry of Commerce.

The complete description of all the projects linked to this outcome is presented in the Annex 2 and 3.

The rationale for commissioning this evaluation is to better understand UNDP's contribution to recovery programming in Haiti, but also to identify synergies and opportunities for improved programming in future disasters and suggest linkages for future development programming.

Specifically, this exercise will:

(1) Provide evidence to support accountability of projects and programmes;
(2) Provide evidence of the contribution of these projects to the stated outcome
(3) Identify current areas of strengths, weaknesses and gaps, especially with regard to:

    (i) The appropriateness of UNDP's partnership strategy
    (ii) Impediments to achieving the expected results
    (iii) Adjustments to be made
    (iv) Lessons learned for the next disaster response
    (v) Lessons learned on improved linkages between recovery and development programming

It is important to note the timing of this evaluation. The Government of Haiti is leading a transition process whereby the humanitarian coordination structure is being gradually transferred to the National Aid Coordination structure. The recommendations of this evaluation will help to feed into this process.

3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The evaluation will identify the outputs produced and the contributions to results at outcome level and positive or negative changes produced along the way, including possible unexpected results. The evaluation is to identify the key lessons learned and best practices.

Considering the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact, for this evaluation, the evaluator is expected to take the following factors into account for the above mentioned outcome:

- Geographic coverage of projects;
- Timeframe of the projects;
- Issues pertaining to the relevance, performance and success of the project(s)

The following **evaluation criteria** are used by UNDP to help focus evaluation objectives by defining the standards against which the initiative will be assessed.

Relevance concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. It also incorporates the concept of responsiveness—that is, the extent to which UNDP was able to respond to changing and emerging development priorities and needs in a responsive manner.

An essential sub-category of relevance is the criteria of **appropriateness**, which concerns the cultural acceptance as well as feasibility of the activities or method of delivery of a development initiative. While relevance examines the importance of the initiative relative to the needs and priorities of intended beneficiaries, appropriateness examines whether the initiative as it is operationalized is acceptable and is feasible within the local context.

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the initiative's intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved. Assessing effectiveness in outcome evaluations will more likely examine UNDP contributions toward intended outcomes. Assessing effectiveness involves measuring change in the observed outcome and judging the value of the change (positive or negative).

Efficiency measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Efficiency is important in ensuring that resources have been used appropriately and in highlighting more effective uses of resources.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future.

In addition, the scope would also be expected to include documentation of lessons learned, findings and recommendations in the following areas:

- Whether the outcome has been achieved and, if it has not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement;
- An analysis of the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influence the outcome (including the opportunities and threats affecting the achievement of the outcome) and the contributions of other bilateral and multilateral donors;
- Whether UNDP’s outputs and other interventions can be credibly linked to achievement of the outcome, including the key outputs, programmes, projects and assistance soft and hard that contributed to the outcome;
- Whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective.
- An analysis of where opportunities exist and the extent to which UNDP can improve recovery programming in the future.

The main stakeholders for this evaluation are: UNDP Haiti, Key Government Implementing Partners including: Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Public Works, the Ministry of Women’s Affairs, the Ministry of Youth and the Ministry of Commerce, UN Agencies (In particular, WFP, ILO, UNHABITAT & UNOPS) and NGO partners. A comprehensive list of stakeholders will be provided to the Consultant.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Relevance

1. Did this outcome respond to National Priorities?
2. Were the projects in this outcome responsive to the changing development situation?
3. Where the project implementation strategies appropriate given the socio-economic and cultural context in Haiti?

Effectiveness

4. Was the stated outcome of “Living conditions of earthquake affected population improved” and its related main outputs achieved?
5. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the outcome?
6. To what extent has UNDP outputs and assistance contributed to the outcome?
7. To what extent the UNDP along with other UN agencies contributed to the outcome?
8. Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
9. To what extent did the monitoring practices provide the management with a proper flow of information allowing for continuous learning and making adjustments accordingly?

10. What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Efficiency

11. In neighborhoods where UNDP has undertaken multiple recovery initiatives (Debris, CARMEN, 16/6): did the implementation strategies employed by UNDP ensure the complementarity of its interventions?

12. Were the results more positive in these areas?

13. Did this result in a more efficient use of funding?

14. Did the UN Joint Programme modality prove to more efficient that UNDP implementation alone?

Sustainability

15. How was gender mainstreamed into the achievement of the outcome? Were the actions taken effective? If yes, How?
16. How where the UNDPs principles on gender and human rights reflected in the outcomes?
17. How did the initiatives carried out under this outcome relate to National public policies or strategies?

18. Did the initiatives carried out under this outcome contribute to the establishment of new public policies or strategies?

19. How was gender mainstreamed into the achievement of the outcome? Were the actions taken effective? If yes, How?
20. how where the UNDPs principles on gender and human rights reflected in the outcomes?

5. METHODOLOGY

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies, including UN Standards and Norms for Evaluations[1], UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results[2], and in particular UNDP outcome-level evaluation a companion guide to the handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators[3]. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to

---

[1] Available at UNEG Webpage: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4
[2] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/
[3] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcome-Level%20_Evaluation_2011.pdf

address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the purpose of the evaluation.

The Evaluator is expected to use either or a combination of the following methodological approaches in implementing this evaluation exercise:

- Documentation review (desk study, ADR See Annex: Preliminary list of document);
- Interviews; individual and/or group interviews (or other primary data collection methods like focus groups)
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data;
- Participation of stakeholders and/or partners.

Evaluator will review available key documents and conduct a thorough desk review. These documents encompass the ones closely related to the project as well as context-specific ones from the government and other organizations. Preliminary list of documents to be consulted is attached in Annex 2. The desk review is of primary importance as information contained therein will be cross-checked by primary research methods.

The evaluation should include but not necessarily be limited to the following methods:

- desk review of relevant documents (project document, quarterly, semi-annual and annual project reports, minutes of technical meetings, reports on project activities, relevant national policy documents etc.);
- individual and/or group interviews (or other primary data collection methods like focus groups) with members of the Project Board, main governmental stakeholders and civil society, representatives of the counterparts and implementing partners;
- interviews (or other primary data collection methods like focus groups) with a representative sample of the project beneficiaries based on a pre-designed questionnaire;
- meeting with representatives of donors;
- field visits to facilities and groups supported under the project;
- questionnaires

6. Evaluation Products

The main product from this evaluation will be the followings:

1) **Evaluation inception report**— An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full fledged evaluation exercise. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating

a team evaluator member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. It should detail the evaluator' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedureThis information shall be reflected in an evaluation matrix, for example:

SAMPLE EVALUATION MATRIX				
Criteria/Sub-criteria	**(Examples of) questions to be addressed by outcome-level evaluation**	**What to look for**	**Data sources**	**Data collection methods**

2) Evaluation brief: presentation of the preliminary findings at the ending of field mission (last day as debriefing meeting)

3) Draft evaluation report—The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. An outline for the draft and final evaluation report is attached in Annex 3.

- **4) Final evaluation report and other knowledge products.** The final report should not be longer than 35 pages, excluding the annexes and the executive summary which include:
    - Strategies for continuing or concluding UNDP assistance towards the outcome;
    - Recommendations for formulating future post-disaster/recovery assistance Recommendations on opportunities for linking more explicitly recovery and development initiatives
    - Lessons learned concerning best and worst practices in producing outputs from project results, linking them to the outcome and using partnerships strategically;
    - A rating on progress towards outcome and progress towards outputs;

<u>The Evaluation report should be written in French.</u>

- **5) Evaluation brief: s**econd meeting and a presentation of the final report with findings, concussions and recommendations

It is important to note that UNDP is one of many partners contributing to the outcome being considered under this exercise. As a result, the methodology to be used should take into account UNDP's comparative advantages, positioning, and constraints as a development agency in Haiti.

7. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION and REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Evaluation will be conducted by two independents experts without prior involvement in the project. The evaluators will not act as representative of any party and should remain independent and impartial throughout the evaluation

UNDP Haiti anticipates a team of two individuals with at least 7 evaluation processes completed. Individuals with experiences of conducting outcome level evaluations are especially preferred. In order to ensure that the National context is taken into consideration, UNDP anticipates 1 International Consultant and 1 National Consultant.

The International Consultant will have the overall responsibility of managing the evaluation team, outlining the division of work between the two consultants, supervising the National consultant and ensuring that the products are delivered on time and that they meet the quality standards outlined in these terms of reference.

The National Consultant will work under the guidance of the International Consultant to ensure an appropriate contextual analysis is included in the evaluation and will also provide knowledge on National and Local partners.

Both consultants must have at minimum, a Master's degree in the Social and Economical Sciences or related fields. Previous experience in evaluating post-disaster recovery responses will also be an advantage. Strong reporting and excellent communication and interpersonal skills, Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods to projects and/or programmes Please note that the evaluation team should be fluent in French and English. <u>The Evaluation report should be written in French.</u>

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

To facilitate the outcome evaluation process, UNDP Haiti will set up an Evaluation Management Team (EMT) headed by the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and including a Programme Analysts of the Livelihoods Unit.

The EMT will review this Terms of Reference with the Evaluation Team and agree on any necessary amendments; share all relevant documentation; review, provide feedback and accept the inception report; assist in identifying stakeholders; review and provide feedback on the draft report; assist in organizing the debriefing meeting for key stakeholders; and, accept the final report. A wider “reference group”, including representatives from other UNDP Programme units,UN agencies, donors, and civil society, will be invited to key meetings and the final debriefing.

The Livelihoods Unit will assist with logistics, arranging meetings and field visits.

9. EVALUATION ETICS

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlines in the UN Evaluation Group “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations” and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators must be signed before starting with the evaluation process.

10. TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

- This process should last for 40 days with deliverables as follows (Expected duration: 30 September 2013 – 17 November 2013):

Tasks	Number of w/days	Tentative dates	Expected result and deliverables
Preparation of inception report: Desk review of project document, reports and other background documents, development of evaluation methodology	5 days		Inception Report
Collecting comments on inception report from UNDP	3 Days		
Field mission: Site Visits, Meetings and interviews with stakeholders, beneficiaries and Partners; debriefing	15 days		Data Collection
Data analysis and preparation of the draft report	12 days		Draft Reports
Collecting comments on draft report from UNDP	7 days		
Finalization of the report on the basis of comments received	7 days		Final Report
Presentation of final evaluation report	1 day		Presentation

Total working days(incl. travel)	40

11. Payment Schedule with deliverables

Deliverables	Payment
Inception Report	1st payment: 25% of the total
Draft Report	2nd payment: 35% of the total
Final Report	3rd payment: 40% of the total

12. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Summary of projects in this outcome

Annex 2: Projects Tree

Annex 3: Preliminary list of document

Annex 4: UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards

Annex 5: Code of Conduct for UNEG evaluators

Annex 6: UNEG Ethical Guidelines

Annex 1: Summary of projects carried out under the Outcome

Area of Intervention	Objective	Contribution towards the Outcome
Debris Management	1. Remove debris from the neighbourhoods affected by the January 2010 Earthquake by demlolishing unsafe/destroyed stuctures and clearing debris from the streets, transport the debris to dumping/reecycling sites, use recycled debris to produce material that can be reutilized for community rehabilitation activities. 2. Create short term jobs through out the chain of debris management	Improve conditions of sanitation in the affected neighborhoods, help to restore livelihoods, help to encourage the return to affected neighourhoods
Cash for work	1. Create short term jobs 2. Support community rehabilitation	Restore livelihoods for affected population and other zones to prevent the pull factor, support improvement of community infrastructure in rural and urban areas
Housing repair	Provide information to 5 communities on the reconstruction activities in their zone; use an owner driven repair approach to repair 1000 homes damaged by the earthquake; improve quality of reconstruction activities through safe construction training	Improve access to information; Improve housing conditions for 1000 families in affected communities, improve livelihood opportunities of construction workers in these areas
ER Coordination	Support coordination of recovery activities in Haiti and manage the Early Recovery Cluster	Ensure a coordinated and strategic approach to recovery activities which aimed to improve living conditions
*Community rehabilitation and return of IDPs	Support the return of IDPs in key camps and support the community rehabilitation process in return zones (housing, community platforms, community infrastructure, economic activities)	Directly improve the living conditions in 50 camps and 8 neighbourhoods
*Support to micro-entreprise development	Economic empowerment of women in earthquake affected areas	Improve livelihoods of women participating the programme through business development services and training programmes

*For specific information on these projects, please see attached Dashboard for 16/6

Annex 2: Project Tree

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
1	0006294 1	Relèvement Artibonite/Cap	Nombre de réseaux de système d'eau réhabilités % de sediments enleves Un bassin versant identifie et en cours d'aménagement Nombre de familles assistées grâce aux HIMO nombre d'arbres plantes Nombre de personnes formées à la gestion durable des ressources naturelles Nombre d'initiatives entreprises dans la gestion des ressources naturelles par la population locale	Obstruction des voies de communication terrestre et d'accès aux infrastructures sociales par les sédiments qui proviennent de la succession des tempêtes tropicales et ouragans de 2008 10% d'accès a 'eau potable après les cyclones Peu d'opportunités d'emploi 2500 ha de terrains exposes a l'érosion	3,000 ml de canaux de drainage curés et 1,000 ml réparés 7,500 m3 de déchets solides évacués 1,500 emplois court terme créés 5 systèmes d'adduction d'eau réhabilités 350 personnes des Organisations Communautaires de Base (OCB) formées 10 engins lourds/camions réparés et opérationnels
2	0006323 8	Relèvement National & Ouest	Nbre d'études d'aménagement de bassins versants réalisées Nbre de plans communaux d'aménagement	Les bassins versants et les infrastructures socio-économiques ont été sévèrement	4 études d'aménagement de bassins versants réalisées 4 plans communaux d'aménagement

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
			des bassins versants élaborés Nbre d'emplois court terme créés Nbre de formations techniques réalisées Nbre d'hectares de terre protégés /restaurés Nbre de ravines protégées Nbre de systèmes d'adduction d'eau réalisés Nbre de km de canaux d'irrigation/drainage réhabilités et/ou construits Nbre de km de routes agricoles réhabilitées et nbre d'ouvrages réalisés Nbre de km de berges de rivières protégées	endommagées par les catastrophes naturelles (cyclones 2008, tremblement de terre Janv. 2010, cyclone Tomas Oct. 2010) puis par l'épidémie de choléra	des bassins versants élaborés 10,000 emplois CT créés 30 formations techniques réalisées 1,000 hectares de terre protégés /restaurés 50 ravines protégées 10.5 km d'adduction d'eau réhabilités et 7 ouvrages construits 40 km de canaux d'irrigation/drainage curés et/ou réhabilités 60 km de routes agricoles réhabilitées et 50 ouvrages réalisés 2.5 km de berges de rivières protégées
3	00063239	Relèvement Coordination	Lack of information about debris initiatives, housing standards or livelihoods support requirements.	After the earthquake, there was limited coordination in terms of debris removal, housing & settlements and	Au moins 12 réunions plus réunions ad hoc sont organisées Au moins 20 partenaires participent régulièrement dans les initiatives du

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
				livelihoods	cluster Au moins, 4 produits concernant relèvement immédiat sont élaborés d'une façon participative Au moins 2 études / recherches / initiatives sur Relèvement Immédiat ont été menées en 2011. Toutes les demandes des partenaires du cluster ER ont été prises en considération et prise en charge lorsque pertinent et possible
4	00070260	Relevement - Nord-Ouest	Nombre de réseaux de système d'eau réhabilités Un bassin versant identifie et en cours d'aménagement Nombre de familles assistées grâce aux HIMO	10% d'accès à 'eau potable après les cyclones Peu d'opportunités d'emploi 2500 ha de terrains exposes a l'érosion	2 études d'aménagement de bassins versants réalisées 2 plans communaux d'aménagement des bassins versants élaborés 3,000 emplois CT créés 15 formations techniques

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
			Nombre d’initiatives mises en place pour améliorer la sécurité alimentaires pour 5,000 personnes Nombre de personnes bénéficiant des initiatives de restauration des moyens d’existence et amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire		réalisées 500 hectares de terre protégés /restaurés 30 ravines protégées 2 systèmes d’adduction d’eau potable réhabilités 15 km de canaux d’irrigation/drainage réhabilités et/ou construits 10 km de routes agricoles réhabilitées et 25 ouvrages réalisés 3 km de berges de rivières protégées
5	00075720	Gestion Débris Leogane/Palmes	- Surface préparée pour le traitement des débris Volume de débris traités; - Pas de politiques disponibles pour la gestion des débris dus aux sinistres - Peu d’audits environnementaux menés a bien - Pas de laboratoire de test des matériaux de constructions accrédités identifie en Haïti	Pas d'installation de traitement en place Pas d'autorisation pour la terre, pas de consultation locale participative L'alimentation en eau et en électrique n'est pas disponible L'accès au site est fourni par la	300.000 mètres cubes de débris sont collectés ; 72817m2 préparés pour le traitement des débris;

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
				route reliant le site à l'autoroute 2et route secondaire doit être amélioré pour utilisation par les camions lourds, d'une clôture	
6	0007698 3	Gestion Débris PortauPrince I	- Nbre de plan zonal - Nbre de réunions du comité de pilotage, - Nbre de sites identifiés - Nbre de plans communautaires de stockage et de recyclage établis - Un guide de gestion juridique est rédigé - Nbre de compagnies privées identifiées - Nbre de matériels d'équipement acquis et remis aux populations pour entreprendre le nettoyage des quartiers - Nbre de tonnes de débris recyclés Nbre de tonnes de gravats évacués - Nbre	- Le tremblement de terre à détruit les capacités de gestion de la municipalité; - Le MTPTC n'est pas en mesure de proposer une stratégie d'évacuation des débris - 6 quartiers de Port-au-Prince sont jonchés de décombres; - Les populations sont sous informées des projets de nettoyage et de réaménagement des quartiers ; - Pas de référence en terme de	1)Six plans zonal ont été développés et validés par la communauté et partenaires clés au projet ; 2)La gestion des débris est inscrite dans les objectifs du MTPTC et de la municipalité ; 3)Tous les matériels pour la mise en œuvre du projet sont acquis ; 4)Une meilleure compréhension des enjeux de la reconstruction d'Haïti et des quartiers de Port-au-Prince. ; 5)Les micro-entreprises voient leurs capacités de mise en œuvre de suivi de projet

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
			d’infrastructures de proximité réalisées (petit marché, routes adoquinées); - Nbre de conférences de presse effectuées - Nbre de diffusion de messages par les media - Suivi et monitoring - Nbre de documents de vulgarisation rédigés - Nbre de visites de journalistes dans les quartiers; - Nbre d’études réalisées - Nbre de micro-entreprises associées au projet; - Nbre de bureau ouvert et équipé - Nbre de personnes recrutées - Moyens logistiques déployés ; - Nbre de sessions de formation des communautés ; - Nbre de micro-entreprises créées - Nbre de journées de formation ; - Nbre d’engins de	gestion des débris, liée au tremblement de terre. - Il n’existe pas d’équipe en charge de ce type de projet - La dynamique sociale des quartiers est ralentie à cause du tremblement de terre - L’activité socio économique informelle a été détruite à cause du tremblement de terre ; les petits entrepreneurs ont perdu leur outil de travail ; - Le projet de gestion des débris est en phase de démarrage. - Plus de 230.000 m3 de débris jonchent six quartiers de Port-au-Prince	renforcées ; 6)18 Personnels recrutés - 1 bureau ouvert et équipé - 3 Véhicules et 1 génératrice achetés - Les moyens administratifs et financiers sont déployés ; 7)Un plan de restructuration des quartiers sert de base au plan de gestion des débris. Les capacités des organisations communautaires sont établies ; 8)24 entreprises créées dans les quartiers - 600 personnes formées en gestion d’entreprises ; 9) 2 concasseurs en fonctionnement - 24 camions et des engins de chantiers sont disponibles et réaffectés à d’autres projets ; 10) Les six quartiers de Port-au-Prince sont déchargés de

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
			chantiers achetés ou loués - Nbre de camions loués Nbre de crushers achetés ou loués - Nbre de site de stockage établis et fonctionnels ; - Nbre de maisons détruites - Nbre de m3 de débris évacués		162.000 m3 de débris
7	00079379	CARMEN	jusqu'à présent, il n'y pas aucune sorte de centres de ressources communautaires établis après le tremblement de terre	Les 5 territoires ciblés disposent de Centres d'Appui pour le Renforcement de Maisons Endommagées au niveau des quartiers pour faciliter l'accès a l'information, la formation, l'appui technique, l'accès a bons matériaux de construction et autres ressources communautaires pour le développement local et retour de population	# de demandes d'information # de participants dans les courses de formation # d'évaluations techniques # subventions pour la reconstruction

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
				déplacée	
8	0007947 1	Gestion débris PortauPrince II	- Nbre de réunions du comité de pilotage - Nbre de m3 enlevés - Nbre de m3 transportés a Trutier - Nbre de m3 des débris recycles (a travers autres projets) - Nbre des travaux a court terme crées (CFP) - Nbre des maisons/bâtiments rouges démolies - Nbre de diffusion de messages par les medias - Nbre des brochures/matériel informatif circulé - Nbre de visites de journalistes dans les quartiers - Nbre de bureau ouvert et équipé	- Le tremblement de terre à affaibli les capacités de gestion de la municipalité - Le MTPTC manque la capacité de proposer une stratégie d'évacuation des débris - Quatre zones avec surtout une population pauvre de Port-au-Prince sont jonchés de décombres - Les populations sont sous informées des projets de nettoyage et de réaménagement des quartiers - Au moins de 625.000 m3 de débris jonchent quatre zones a Port-au-Prince - La présence des débris posent un	- 4 LTAs établis pour chaque zone d'intervention pour la démolition et le déblaiement de 625 000 m3 de débris - 4 Contrats ponctuels établies pour chaque zone - 10 personnels recrutées - 1 bureau ouvert et équipé - 3 véhicules achetés - Systèmes de gestion et suivi mis établi - 150,000m3 de débris sont enlevés dans 4 zones dans les communes de Port-au-Prince et de Petionville

	Output Project	Description	Indicator	Baseline	Target
				obstacle pour le retour de la population vers leurs quartiers d'origine	

Annex 3: Preliminary list of document

Project documents for all of the projects will be available

Knowledge management products will be available for Debris Management, Cash for Work and Community rehabilitation

Annex 4: UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Ethical Standards for Evaluations'.[66]

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible (see Chapter 8 for more information). The report should also include the following:

Title and opening pages—Should provide the following basic information:

- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time-frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents—Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary—A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

- Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction—Should:

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies, or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention.)

- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and asses the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit**, and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results map or results framework**, **implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals.**
- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives—The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- **Evaluation scope**—The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- **Evaluation objectives**—The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- **Evaluation criteria**—The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used.[67] The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.

- **Evaluation questions**—Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods[68]—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- **Data sources**—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- **Sample and sampling frame**—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
- **Data collection procedures and instruments**—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- **Performance standards**[69]—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- **Stakeholder participation**—Stakeholders' participation in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- **Ethical considerations**—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).[70]
- **Background information on evaluators**—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- **Major limitations of the methodology**—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis—The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Findings and conclusions—The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- **Findings**—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- **Conclusions**—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to 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—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming.

Lessons learnt—As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learnt from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes—Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited

- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conductsigned by evaluators

Annex 7. UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards

Download Handbook

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Ethical Standards for Evaluations'.[66]

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible (see Chapter 8 for more information). The report should also include the following:

Title and opening pages—Should provide the following basic information:

- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time-frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents—Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary—A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

- Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.

- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction—Should:

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies, or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention.)
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and asses the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit**, and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results map or results framework**, **implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals.**
- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives—The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- **Evaluation scope**—The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- **Evaluation objectives**—The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- **Evaluation criteria**—The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used.[67] The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- **Evaluation questions**—Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods[68]—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- **Data sources**—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- **Sample and sampling frame**—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
- **Data collection procedures and instruments**—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- **Performance standards**[69]—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- **Stakeholder participation**—Stakeholders' participation in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

- **Ethical considerations**—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).[70]
- **Background information on evaluators**—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- **Major limitations of the methodology**—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis—The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Findings and conclusions—The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- **Findings**—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- **Conclusions**—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to 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—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming.

Lessons learnt—As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learnt from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes—Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators