



Ministère de l'Environnement
Government of Haiti



United Nations Development Program

Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti

PID 73302/ PIMS 3971

MID TERM REVIEW

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Position: International consultant

Objective: evaluation for the mid-term review (MTR) of the GEF project “Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti”.

Duration: 30 days of work, 14 days in Haiti

Period: October 2013

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, mid-term reviews are required for full sized UNDP supported projects with GEF financing, and are highly recommended for medium-sized projects with GEF financing. All full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the “**Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti**” (PIMS 3971).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Project Title: | Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | PIMS 3971 | | <i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i> | <i>at completion (Million US\$)</i> |
| UNDP Project ID: | PID 73302 | GEF financing: | 3,500,000 | N/A |
| Country: | Haïti | Implementing agency (UNDP) own: | 200,000 | N/A |
| Region: | Latin America and Caribbean | Other : CIDA | 2,200,000 | N/A |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Government: Ministry of Environment: | 2,900,000 | N/A |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | LDCF | Total co-financing: | 5,180,000 | N/A |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment | Total Project Cost: | 13 980 000 | N/A |
| Other Partners involved: | CNIGS,CIAT, CNSA | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 18/04/2011 |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: June 2014 | Actual: |

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The proposed project follows from the findings and recommendations of Haiti's NAPA, which has identified the coastal development sector as a top national priority for climate change adaptation. In line with guidance for the LDCF (GEF/C.28/18, May 12, 2006), this proposal seeks LDCF funding for a programmatic approach to support climate risks management (CRM) in the most vulnerable Low-Elevation Coastal Zones (LECZ) of Haiti. LDCF resources will be used specifically to meet the additional cost of building national and local adaptive capacities, enhancing the resilience of current coastal development policies and plans to climate change risks, as well as implementing an urgent set of pilot adaptation measures in response to the most pressing threats posed by climate change on coastal populations and economy.

Ranking 155th in the HDR list, Haiti belongs to the poorest LDCs group and has long been vulnerable to climate related disasters. Haiti has long been vulnerable to tropical storms and hurricanes. The country lies on the primary pathway of tropical storms that originate in the Atlantic and strike Caribbean islands every hurricane season. However, in recent years, the country has been afflicted by a significant increase in the occurrence of severe natural disasters. Haiti has recently been identified as one of the country's most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.

The main climate change-induced problem facing most vulnerable Low-Elevation Coastal Zones (LECZ) of Haiti to be addressed by the project is that climate change is likely to further increase. The local and national governments presently lack the technical capacity, management capacity, physical resources and financial resources to overcome or cope with the anticipated changes. The coastal population in particular lacks the capacity, resources and financial assistance to adapt to and overcome worsening climatic conditions.

The present proposal addresses climate change adaptation needs, a national development priority and identified in the current UN and UNDP cooperation frameworks in Haiti. In particular, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2006-2010 and the UNDP Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) identifies climate change as a major threat to development and UNDP Haiti is committed to invest core resources to support the project. This project, being the first of its kind, with support from the GEF, and other national and international partners, will try to help raise awareness on vulnerability of coastal areas in the context of CC, and the relationship between CC and food security. The project through a systemic approach will focus on advocating for better planning and investment policies in coastal areas and food security, building capacities and improving better decision frameworks where and when possible. While this initiative will focus largely on the impact of climate change in coastal zones, it will also analyze and state the importance of the key sectors which are integral to the overall development goals set forth in the NAPA, namely water management and food security. To achieve this, the following outcomes will be delivered:

Project Objective: To strengthen adaptive capacities of populations and productive sectors in coastal areas to address increasing climate change risks.

Project outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Institutional capacity to plan for and respond to increasing coastal and food security hazards improved.
- Outcome 2: Climate risks management is fully mainstreamed into humanitarian and development investment frameworks.
- Outcome 3: Resilience of low-elevation coastal zones and for the food security sector to emerging climate change threats enhanced.
- Outcome 4: Models of best practices and lessons learned from the project activities captured and institutionalized.

The MTR will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

With the objective to strengthen the project adaptive management and monitoring, mid-term reviews are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. As such the MTR provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. Another objective of the MTR is to ensure accountability for the achievement the GEF objective. Through the identification and documentation of lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects) an MTR also enhances organizational and development learning.

The main stakeholders of this MTR are: evaluation users, partners, donors and staff of executing and other relevant agencies, beneficiaries...).

| Institution | Affiliation | Activities concerning |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Ministry of Environment (MDE) | State | Issues related to the conservation of coastal ecosystems, EWS, formulation of environmental policies. |

| | | |
|--|-------|---|
| Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources and Rural Development (MARNDR) CNSA | State | Issues related to watershed management, land resources management, food security, EWS and forestry. |
| Prime Minister Office CIAT | State | Issues related to land use planning |
| Ministry of Public Works (MTPTC) covering: DINEPA BME SMCRS | State | Issues related to building and land management, managing potable water and sanitation system, and waste management. |
| Ministry of Planning (MPCE), covering; CNIGS | State | Issues related to territory zoning, land use, climate change data collection and monitoring topographical changes. |
| Ministry of Economy and Finances, covering; FAES | State | Issues related to fiscal incentives for sound environmental management, baseline research for GEF funded projects covered through FAES. |
| Ministry of Health (MSPP), covering; POCHEP DHP | State | Issues related to water quality control. |
| Ministry of Culture and Information | State | Issues related to protection of natural and historic coastal marine zones. |
| Ministry of Trade and Industry | State | Issues related to sustainable development and improved construction practices. |
| Ministry of Tourism | State | Issues related to ecologically sustainable tourism infrastructure development. |
| Ministry of Justice and Public Security, covering; PNH (National Police of Haiti) | State | Issues related to law enforcement. |
| Ministry of National Education and Vocational | State | Issues related to development of environmental inclusive curriculum to |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|---|
| Training | | increase awareness among the public. |
| MICT, covering; DPC OPDES OSAHM | Private | Issues related to baseline actions, hazard reduction and disaster management. |
| NGO, Private Commercial Enterprises, & Universities | Local Government | Issues related to climate change awareness, research and analysis as well as development of training methodology and materials. |
| Municipalities | Local Government | Issues related to the enforcement of site specific urban land use planning laws and facilitation of climate change adaptation methods of construction. |
| UNDP | Multilateral Agency | Issues related to climate change vulnerability reduction |
| USAID | Bilateral Agency | Issues related to reducing climate risks and to providing climate information |
| Community Based Organizations (CBOs) | Private | Issues related to information dissemination on local knowledge on adaptation measures, and execution of local activities and community land use planning. |

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project mid-term reviews of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Haïti including if necessary the following project sites: Jacmel, pilot project in South-East department. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project manager and project team, UNDP Haïti,
- Ministry of Environment,
- Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources Department,
- GEF focal point in Haiti,
- CNIGS, CIAT, CNSA, DINEPA,
- Direction Départementale de l'Environnement du Sud Est,
-

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

| Evaluation Ratings: | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|---|--------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation | rating | 2. IA& EA Execution | rating |
| M&E design at entry | | Quality of UNDP Implementation | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency | |
| Overall quality of M&E | | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes | rating | 4. Sustainability | rating |
| Relevance | | Financial resources: | |
| Effectiveness | | Socio-political: | |
| Efficiency | | Institutional framework and governance: | |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | | Environmental : | |
| | | Overall likelihood of sustainability: | |

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

²A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days according to the following plan:

| Activity | Timing | Completion Date |
|--------------------------------|---------|---|
| Preparation | 3 days | Final date of completion will be determined based on signature date of the contract which should take place in the period of September to October 2013. |
| Evaluation Mission | 14 days | |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 10 days | |
| Final Report | 3 days | |

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 10 days of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| Final Report* | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Reports shall be submitted in English.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar GEF financed projects. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following competencies and qualifications:

- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience in Environmental sciences, Climate Change impacts, mitigation and adaptation or related field,
- Professional expertise and experience in Climate Change impacts, mitigation and adaptation
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF,
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies,
- Previous experience with mid-term evaluation/review of GEF funded projects,
- Previous experience in Haiti or in the Caribbean region,

- Proficiency in English and French. Strong abilities to write evaluation reports, good oral and written communication skills in both French and English.
- Strong abilities to analysis and attention to detail,
- Capable of planning, organizing, initiative and autonomy,
- Capacity to work in a multicultural environment and several languages.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

| % | Milestone |
|-----|---|
| 10% | Upon presentation of inception report |
| 40% | Following submission <u>and approval</u> of the 1ST draft mid-term review report |
| 50% | Following submission <u>and approval</u> (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final mid-term review report |

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://www.ht.undp.org/content/haiti/fr/home/operations/jobs.html>

by 17th July 2013. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV and the financial offer for this position. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| <p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Environment and natural resources management improved</p> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: 1) Strategic, legal, institutional and communicational frameworks are developed, and their implementation promoted in order to better address environmental and natural resources management problems at the national and local levels. 2) Tools and systems to improve access to drinking water, sanitation services, and management of solid wastes are developed and implemented.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. <u>Promote climate change adaptation</u> OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.</p> | | | | | |
| | Indicator | Baseline | Targets End of Project | Source of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| Project Objective³ To strengthen adaptive capacities of populations and productive sectors in coastal areas to address increasing climate change risks | 1. 1. Number of existing department to integrate climate change risks into departmental plans 2. Number of related ministries, municipalities, CBOs and research institutions implementing climate change adaptation activities. | 1. None of the current existing departments integrate climate risks into planning processes. 2. None of the current set of (ministries, municipalities, CBOs and research institutions) implement cc-adaptation related activities. | 1. Increase in current number by 100%. 2. Increase the current number by 50% over established baseline at the beginning of the project. | 1. Publication of the ToRs and the list of individuals for the established department. 2. Surveys | 1. The impacts of climate change are far greater than predicted, for example, much more rain. 2. The agriculture, water resource sectors in coast zones are affected by globally-induced crisis. 3. The logistic challenges from the recent earthquake further slow down the capacity strengthening activities in already fragile areas. 4. Needs of women are not taken seriously by the communities. |

³ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Outcome 1⁴ Institutional capacity to plan for and respond to increasing coastal and food security hazards improved | 1. Allocation of budget for CC adaptation targets in sectoral plans (Ministries, CIAT; SNGRD, CNSA, MARNDR) 2. Percentage of vulnerable communes with published emergency evacuation plans adjusted to take into account increased climate risks 3. Strengthened capacities to understand and address adaptation to CC in Haiti | 1. None 2. 20 communes with EWS 3. none | 1. CIAT, MDE, MPCE, MARNDR; SNGRD; CNIGS, DINEPA; ONEV; CNSA all allocate budget lines to clearly defined adaptation targets 2. 30 communes with EWS adapted to increased climate risks and communal development plans with CC adaptation criteria 3. Key development institutions (CIAT, Primature, MARNDR; MDE;MPCE;MICT ; MTPTC;MSPP; CNIGS; ONEV;CNSA) trained in adaptation to CC and with installed technical capacities capable of implementing | 1. Review of sectoral plans 2. Review of municipal plans 3. Review of institutional guidelines 4. Review of budget allocation and adaptation targets 5. Questionnaires and surveys. 6. Surveys of CBOs, NGOs and international organizations | 1. Insufficient coordination between line ministries and institutional bottlenecks prevent successful formulation and implementation of the project. 2. Country's political stability which was affected in the aftermath of the recent earthquake |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|

⁴ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

| | | | adaptation actions according to NAPA | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Outcome 2 Climate Risks Management is fully mainstreamed into humanitarian and development investment frameworks | 1. Percentage of national investment frameworks incorporating adaptation to climate risks. 2. Percentage of humanitarian and development organizations with adaptation targets and budget lines | 1. Some NGOs are starting to incorporate CC adaptation within donor financed investment plans 2. None of the national policy and investment frameworks (post disaster recovery plan, national plans for poverty reduction etc..) include adaptation to CC targets | 1) 50% of the programmes funded through the interim commission for the reconstruction of Haiti include adaptation to CC targets and clear budget allocations 2) 60% of the donor organizations operating in Haiti have included adaptation to CC in coastal areas as a priority of their investment 3) 100% of the national development policies and plans have budget allocated to address clear adaptation to CC targets in coastal areas | 1. Review of donor funded programs in Haiti 2. Survey of donor organizations 3. Review of policy documents | 1. Low absorptive and technical capacities of national institutions results in delays and sub-optimal performance. 2. Major disaster or political instability forcing donor community and central government to review investment priorities |
| Outcome 3 | 1. Enhanced | 1. Current field | 1. 100% increase in the | 1. Municipal surveys | 1. Political instability |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Resilience of low-elevation coastal zones to emerging climate change threats enhanced. | <p>awareness and response capacity to climate change and its impacts, particularly on water, agriculture and food security by the communities in pilot areas</p> <p>2. Adaptation technologies for water, agriculture and food security sector by technology types transferred to targeted areas</p> <p>3. Strengthened capacities to address climate risk in rural livelihoods and food security strategies in targeted areas</p> | <p>programs efforts remain largely dispersed with very little consideration paid to the new patterns of risk brought about by climate variability and change</p> <p>2. No information available on the effect of CC on the water, agriculture and food security sector in coastal areas and no mitigation plans available</p> <p>3. No information available on the effect of CC on rural livelihoods and food security in vulnerable watersheds, among vulnerable groups (i.e. women) and no mitigation plans available</p> | <p>outreach and sensitization activities in all the communes in the pilot areas</p> <p>2. Investments needs identified to climate proof the water and agriculture sector in the southern departments and relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas installed</p> <p>3. Investment needs identified to climate proof rural livelihoods, food security strategies in targeted vulnerable watersheds and among vulnerable groups, and efficient monitoring system in place to guide adapted transfer of technology in targeted areas and for targeted vulnerable groups</p> | <p>2. Verification of technology installed in targeted areas</p> <p>3. Review of contracts and ToRs</p> | <p>or degradation of the security situation may hamper the project from operating normally and effectively</p> <p>2. Major disaster forcing to review investment priorities</p> |
| Outcome 4 Models of best practices and lessons learned from the project activities | <p>1. Number of 'lessons learned' systematized about managing climate change risks in coastal areas</p> <p>2. Number of men and women (public and</p> | <p>1. There is very little available information on the adaptive capacities of populations and productive sectors</p> | <p>1. existence of knowledge forums and networks on adaptation to CC by the end of the project</p> <p>2. By the end of the project, at least "30"% of the women have access to</p> | <p>1. database that will enable local, national and international access to project information.</p> <p>2. Gender-sensitive surveys among communities.</p> <p>3. Participation in</p> | <p>1. Occurrence of natural disasters during preparation or implementation phase may deviate government and donors' attention to the project.</p> <p>2. The recent collapse of all</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| captured and institutionalized | <p>decision makers) having access to best practices and lessons learned from project activities.</p> <p>3. Number of 'lessons learned' disseminated through the ALM platform and other regional networks.</p> | <p>in coastal areas (the baseline will be determined at the inception phase).</p> <p>2. Gender related data are currently not available. The baseline will be determined at the inception phase.</p> <p>3. The baseline will be determined at the inception phase.</p> | <p>best practices and lessons learned from the project in targeted areas over baseline established during the start up phase of the project.</p> <p>3. By the end of the project, project lessons are distributed in hard copy (e.g. pamphlets, briefing notes, newsletters, booklets, etc), electronically (e.g. via the project database), and via national and local workshops.</p> <p>4. Halfway through the project, a database is operational and regularly updated with project information.</p> | <p>workshops.</p> <p>4. Project evaluation report, ALM, publications, studies, reports, and media reports</p> | <p>the major institutional structures may slow down the effective sharing of information across communes and departments</p> |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- Project Document (ProDoc),
- Annual Work Plans,
- Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR),
- project budget revisions,
- progress reports, field visit reports,
- audit reports,
- GEF focal area tracking tools,
- Government of Haiti national development strategy and legal documents (Plan Stratégique de Développement d’Haiti, PSDH),
- UNDP Haiti strategic documents (ISF, CPD, CPAP, Results Oriented Annual Report ROAR),
- GEF strategic documents,
- Projects outputs (studies, surveys, investigations, frameworks developed and presidential orders) and communication documents,
- UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects,
- UNDP Standards, Norms and Code of conduct for evaluation,
- Any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

| Evaluative Criteria Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|--|---|--|
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">How will the project activities, outputs and outcomes participate in the GEF-4 focal area strategy of:<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Achieve biodiversity conservation in protected areas,Catalyze sustainability of protected area systems,Achieve sustainable financing of protected areas system at national levelAnd especially, :<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) appropriate policies and laws to allow protected areas to manage the entire revenue stream from generation of income to investment,b) business plans that include multiple funding sources and have a long-term perspective that matches expenditure to revenue,c) agencies responsible for managing protected areas with sufficient capacity to manage protected areas based on sound principles of business planning as well as conservation biology principles,d) full recognition of the support to protected area conservation and management made by communities living in and near protected areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Indicators in the Project Logical FrameworkOutputs and outcomes described in the ProDoc | <ul style="list-style-type: none">GEF strategic documentsUNDP strategic documentsHaiti national development planProject DocumentReportsTeam and key stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Documents analysisInterviewsField visits |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">How will the project participate in achieving the national development strategy?Regarding the Haitian land planning reorganization programme, to which programme and sub-programme will the project participate? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">How will the project participate in achieving UNDP Haiti strategic objectives describe in UNDP strategic documents? | | | |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Did the project implement the planned activities for the past period?Were expected outcomes and objectives for the past period achieved?What progress toward the planned outcomes has been made? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Indicators in the Project Logical Framework | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Project DocumentReportsTeam and key stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Documents analysisInterviews |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">How were the risks managed? | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">How efficient were the strategies developed to mitigate them? | assumptions identified in the ProDoc? Quality of the mitigation measures described in the ProDoc? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">ReportsTeam and key stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none">analysisInterviews |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Were the logical framework and the work plans followed and used as an implementation tool? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Availability and quality of the narrative and financial reportsConsistency of the reports and respect of the deadlinesDiscrepancy between planed budget and actual expendituresComparison between planed co-financing and actualQuality and consistency of the data entered in the Integrated Work Plan and in AtlasQuantity and quality of changes made between the ProDoc and the actual implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Project documents, reports (including administrative and financial documents)TeamUNDP | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Documents analysisInterviews |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Were the financial and administrative procedures followed to implement the project and produce the accurate financial and administrative data on time? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Were the reporting and monitoring procedures followed? Were the correct and complete reports produced within the deadlines?Were the funds available and disbursed as planned?Were the co-financing and in kind contributions as planned?Were financial resources efficiently used? Could it have been improved? How?Were the procurements done following procedures and contributing to an efficient use of the project resources?Was the use of the "Result based management" method efficient? | | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Are issues of sustainability integrated in the project design?Are they adequately addressed?Have they evolved since the project design? Was the implementation design adapted consequently? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Project sustainability strategy and actions : availability, adequacy and completioninvolvement, actions taken by the key stakeholders especially the implementing partner Ministry and ANAPChanges in the institutional, financial and socioeconomic context | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Project documents, reports (including administrative and financial documents)TeamUNDPKey stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Documents analysisInterviews |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Have new risks to sustainability arisen? Were they mitigation measures implemented? were the sustainability plan adaptedAre the main stakeholders willing and able to use, enforce, follow the project outputs (tools, laws, recommendations) after its completion? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Is there a political will to continue the projects activities?What are the main issues and difficulties that can affect the project's outcomes sustainability? Have they been addressed?How can the project's outcomes sustainability be improved? | | | |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

Please include the following table in the report:

| Rating Project Performance | | |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Criteria | Comments | |
| Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall quality of M&E | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| M&E design at project start up | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Implementing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Executing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Outcomes | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR) | (rate 2pt. scale) | |
| Effectiveness | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Efficiency | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U). | | |
| Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability: | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Financial resources | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Socio-economic | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Institutional framework and governance | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Environmental | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N) | | |
| Environmental Status Improvement | (rate 3 pt. scale) | |
| Environmental Stress Reduction | (rate 3 pt. scale) | |
| Progress towards stress/status change | (rate 3 pt. scale) | |
| Overall Project Results | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁵

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at place on date

Signature: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁷)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁸)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

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

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

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

5. Annexes

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

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____