



## I. Job Details and Scope of Work

Job title: **Consultant** – Final evaluation: Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS) Amerindian Development Fund (ADF): Village Economy Development (Phase II) under the Guyana REDD+ Investment Fund (GRIF) (ADF Phase II Project)

Supervisor: Deputy Resident Representative

Type of contract: IC

Duration: 37 days

Duty Station: Guyana (with travel to interior locations)

## II. Background and Context

Guyana advanced to upper middle-income status with a Human Development Index of 0.638 (2015). Economic activities are concentrated in services, agriculture and mining. Agricultural activities are concentrated in the non-forested low-lying coastal plains, and mining in the vast biodiverse, forested hinterland (>80 per cent of intact forests). In addition to its significant ecological wealth, Guyana is mineral and oil rich. Guyana is facing challenges in translating its natural capital into significant poverty reduction and overall human development. The underlying causes of poverty and inequality are skewed access to quality basic services, lack of employment opportunities, poor management of natural resources and weak governance structures. Amerindians, female-headed households and children remain the most vulnerable to poverty and insecurity.

The Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS) of Guyana set out the vision through which economic development and climate change mitigation will be enabled in the course of the generation of payments for standing forest and eco-system services. A new framework -the Green State Development Strategy, which builds on the successes of the LCDS, is currently under development. The Guyana REDD+ Investment Fund (GRIF) was established to channel results-based payments for avoided deforestation towards the implementation of the LCDS. Some of the resources mobilized through the LCDS are in part directed to more inclusive models of pro-poor growth, targeting those most affected by poverty. Critical to the realization of goals set out in the LCDS is recognition of the important role that indigenous communities play in protecting and sustainably managing the forests.

There are in excess of 180 Indigenous communities located across Guyana but concentrated in a geographic space referred to as the rural interior/hinterland, situated mostly within the boundaries of regions 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9. The population of those communities range between 150 and 5,000 inhabitants. The poverty levels in the rural interior where most of the indigenous communities are located are high, combined 78.6 percent according to the household budget survey of 2006. This is a reflection of traditional lifestyle and cultural freedoms valued by different standards of wealth co-existing with gradual integration into relatively modern aspects of the wider production and consumption structures of the national economy.

Like some aspects of the rest of the national economy, indigenous communities are primarily involved in subsistence, primary productive activities such as agriculture, hunting, fishing and small-scale logging and mining, among others. Amerindians own 13.9 percent of Guyana's land and constitute 10.51% percent of Guyana's population or 78, 492 people, at the last population census in 2012. There are nine groups of Amerindian Peoples in Guyana namely the Warrau, Carib, Akawaios, Arawak, Patamona, Arekuna, Macushi, Wapishana and Wai Wai – each of which has its own distinct cultural identity and heritage, language and traditional economic activities. The diversity of their focus in

community development priorities therefore is a reflection of self-determination revealing idiosyncratic features of communities, their traditions, and special interest in exploiting niche opportunities reachable through the GRIF window.

The LCDS ADF Village Economy Development (Phase II) under the GRIF project was established to provide support for the socio-economic and environmental development of Amerindian communities and villages, through the implementation of Community Development Plans (CDPs). As a precursor to the full-scale project design for the provision of micro-grants under the Amerindian Development Fund Village Economy, 27 Amerindian communities were selected for the disbursement of grants in a pilot phase that lasted in excess of 9 months. The pilot phase was known as the Initiation Plan (IP). The Initiation Plan sought to: 1) Develop and test a financial disbursement mechanism with an accompanying operational manual; 2) Produce the full Project Document; and 3) Strengthen the capacity of the MoAA (currently, MoIPA) to directly manage and support the implementation of the Project. Phase II covers an additional 160 communities through CDPs proposed in agricultural production and processing, village infrastructure, tourism, manufacturing, village business enterprise, and transportation, among others.

This project, implemented by the Ministry of Indigenous People’s Affairs (MoIPA), and supported by UNDP, is based on a transformational approach that aims to strengthen the entrepreneurial capacities and capabilities of Amerindian communities through the provision of micro-capital grants, while engendering a supportive landscape for private enterprise development. This approach aims to facilitate the gradual integration of remote Amerindian communities and economies into the regional and national economy.

### **III. Evaluation Purpose**

This evaluation is intended to assess implementation of the ADF Phase II Project. The ADF Phase II project document envisages that an independent Final Evaluation will be undertaken in the last year of the project.

The Final Evaluation will determine the achievement of project outputs and the extent to which the project has contributed to outcome 1: “Strengthen institutional and regulatory capacities of government, civil society organizations to enable access to sustainable financial and business development services for the economic poor, women and indigenous populations.” It will also assess the contribution made to the achieving of Outcome 2 of the UN Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework (UNMSDF) - Access to equitable social protection systems and quality services and sustainable economic opportunities improved.

This evaluation is intended to substantively contribute both retrospective and prospective analysis that can inform the programmatic choices the UNDP makes in further supporting socio-economic development of Amerindian Communities. In this context, it is expected that practical options will be presented based on this assessment of current capacities at multiple scales, and what future investments that are needed to consolidate, sustain and expand on the gains made during the project.

### **IV. Scope of the Evaluation**

The Evaluation will consider the project, inputs, activities, outputs and the project’s contribution to UNMSDF outcome 2: Access to equitable social protection systems and quality services and sustainable economic opportunities improved.

The primary issues would be the relevance/appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the outputs.

Specifically, this exercise will provide evidence to support accountability of the project; identify current areas of strengths, weaknesses and gaps, especially with regard to: the appropriateness of UNDP’s implementation support as well as impediments to achieving the outputs.

The evaluation is expected to take the following factors into account:

- Geographic and sectoral coverage of CDPs;
- Timeframe of the project;
- Nature and number of partnerships.

The evaluation should provide insights on the successes and challenges of the project, identify important lessons that UNDP and the Government of Guyana can use to inform future interventions in the area of Amerindian village economic development. More specifically, consideration should be given to the effectiveness of the project and the outputs it has produced, as well as the timeliness of implementation. The evaluation should also assess linkages between Amerindian village economic development and poverty reduction in a sustainable development milieu.

Furthermore, a review of the project implementation arrangements including the process of community engagement should also be carried out to identify practical, implementable recommendations to improve future project design, implementation and management measures.

A comprehensive list of communities and villages for ADF Phase II will be provided to the Consultant to aid in carrying out the consultancy.

## **V. Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The evaluation should generate information and provide ratings on the following performance criteria:

*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. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues. Relevance concerns the congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective 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.

- What is the extent to which the Amerindian Development Fund is relevant to national development priorities?
- How relevant is the project design in addressing the outputs?

*Effectiveness:* measures the extent to which the initiative's intended results (outputs) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved:

- Have the intended outputs been achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs?
- How have the practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities of the implementing partners affected the achievement of the outputs?
- To what extent have project outputs contributed to achieving UNMSDF outcome 2: Access to equitable social protection systems and quality services and sustainable economic opportunities improved?
- Is the partnership strategy appropriate, effective and viable for the achievement of the outputs?

*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:

- Has the strategy in producing the outputs been efficient and cost-effective?
- How efficient has the engagement and coordination been among the various stakeholders in implementing the project? What specific roles have they played?

- Has there been any duplication of efforts among UNDP’s interventions and interventions delivered by other organizations in contributing to the outputs?
- What is the assessment of the capacity and institutional arrangements for the implementation of the project?

*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:

- What are the underlying factors beyond the project’s control that influence the outputs (including the opportunities and threats affecting the achievement of the outputs)?
- What is the extent to which established mechanisms ensure sustainability of the outputs?

The evaluation will also:

- Isolate and elaborate lessons emerging from the programme of work implemented;
- Provide recommendations for future interventions in Amerindian village economic development in terms of partners, programming, operations;
- Provide recommendations on how UNDP can better fulfil its commitment to key programming principles and cross-cutting issues (gender mainstreaming, knowledge management, result-based management, capacity building, human-rights based approach and environmental sustainability).

The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex II<sup>1</sup>.

## **VI. Methodology or Evaluation Approach**

The evaluation must be carried out using a sound methodology including a mixed method evaluation i.e. quantitative and qualitative which allows for rigor and provides reliable results for decision making. The evaluation will follow the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards for evaluation as well as the UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluations.

The approach of the evaluation shall be participatory in all phases, particularly in the validation of the findings and conclusions and should be sensitive to gender and human rights and be based on a theory of change. The evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in this ToR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, the consultant is expected to use all available information sources that will provide evidence on which to base evaluation conclusions and recommendations. Findings must therefore be justified with primary and secondary data (in the narrative text). Anticipated approaches to be used for data collection and analysis by the evaluator are: documentation review, interviews with key stakeholders, field visits, questionnaires, participatory techniques, triangulation and participation of stakeholders and/or partners. Data collection methods and process should consider gender sensitivity and data should be systematically disaggregated by gender and age and, to the extent possible, disaggregated by geographical regions, disability, and other contextually-relevant markers of equity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Impact as an evaluation criterion will not be utilized in this evaluation. Impact results – describing changes in people’s lives and development conditions at global, regional and national levels – are considered beyond the scope of this evaluation. Results at the impact level would need to control for the vast array of factors that may have influenced development in this area and would not be feasible nor cost efficient to discern the project’s and UNDP’s contribution to such change.

## VII. Evaluation Products (Deliverables)

UNDP Guyana and the Ministry of Indigenous People’s Affairs expect the following deliverables:

- **Evaluation Inception Report** - This should detail the evaluator’s understanding of the task at hand and a methodology which clearly demonstrates how each evaluation question would be answered by way of: proposed data collection methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection and analysis procedures as reflected in the evaluation matrix. The Inception Report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, identifying who is responsible for each task or product.

**Evaluation matrix:**

Criteria/Sub-criteria	(Examples of) questions to be addressed by project-level evaluation	What to look for	Data sources	Data collection methods	Methods for data analysis
-----------------------	---	------------------	--------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

- **Evaluation brief:** including audio visual presentation of key findings, lessons learned, and recommendations.
- **Draft Evaluation report** – UNDP will provide guidance on the quality criteria that will be used to assess quality of the report. The draft report will be reviewed by UNDP and Ministry of Indigenous People’s Affairs to ensure the evaluation meets expectations and quality criteria and would inform the final evaluation report.
- **Final Evaluation report** – The final evaluation report should not exceed 40-50 pages. The content should comprehensively address the following:
  - Recommendations for formulating future assistance in the outputs if warranted;
  - Lessons learned concerning best and worst practices in producing outputs, linking them to the outcome and using partnerships strategically;
  - A rating on achievement of outputs;
  - A rating on the relevance of the outcome;

## VIII. Management of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be conducted by a Consultant working under the guidance and advice of the Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Guyana. The ADF II PMU, project beneficiaries and other partners will provide inputs to the evaluation process.

## IX. Qualifications and Experience

### Consultant

**EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE:** A minimum of a Master’s degree in the Social Sciences, Sustainable Development, Project Management or related fields.

**TECHNICAL EXPERTISE:** At least 5 years’ experience in conducting project level evaluations of similar scale and scope, as sole evaluator or team leader; or conducted at least 5 recent project evaluations as sole evaluator or team leader in similar or related fields. Understanding of, and experience in, the required evaluation methodologies.

**SECTORAL EXPERTISE:** Expertise in the sectoral area of the project being evaluated - at least 7 years of experience in sustainable development projects. Experience in indigenous issues would be desirable.

Additionally, the evaluator should meet the following secondary requirements

**IMPARTIALITY:** No conflict of interest with any of the parties involved in the evaluation of the project.

**COMMUNICATION and INTERPERSONAL SKILLS:** Able to communicate the evaluation results in a manner that is easily understood by all parties. Able to interact with all parties in a sensitive and effective way.

And should:

- Be available for full participation and intensive work within required timeframes;
- Be prepared to undertake travel to interior locations by boat, small plane, ATV, trail;
- Have working knowledge of community engagement and community economic development initiatives;
- Bring fresh perspectives, insights, experiences and recent state-of-the-art knowledge;
- Be aware of constraints on feasibility of recommendations;
- Be independent of any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the project.

Knowledge of UNDP, its programmes, operations and evaluation procedures, including the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017/2018-2021 would be desirable.

Knowledge of the local context would be desirable.

**LANGUAGE:** Proficiency in English Language is required.

## **X. Evaluation Ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The following should be addressed in the design and implementation of the evaluation:

- Evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data.
- Provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

The evaluator will be required to sign the UNEG evaluation code of conduct.

## **XI. Implementation Arrangements**

### Role of UNDP

UNDP will:

- Recruit, select and approve evaluator;
- Provide pre-evaluation briefing to evaluator;
- Review evaluator's inception report and provide feedback on areas for strengthening;
- Review the draft report and offer comments, if any;
- Approve Final Evaluation report and ensure the overall quality of evaluation;
- Provide substantive feedback on the findings of the evaluation in the form of a management response;

### Role of Ministry of Indigenous People's Affairs

- Provide logistical and documentary support to the evaluator in the implementation of the evaluation including making necessary arrangements for site visits;
- Identify and ensure the participation of relevant national and local stakeholders in the evaluation;
- Review inception, draft and final reports and provide feedback on areas for strengthening; review and provide substantive feedback on the findings of the evaluation in the form of a management response to be submitted to UNDP Guyana;
- Organize and facilitate debriefing with relevant stakeholders on findings of the evaluation.

Procedures to amend TOR:

For amendments to this TOR, specific requests can be made to the Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Guyana.

Reporting relationships:

The Consultant will submit evaluation deliverables to UNDP Guyana.

Time Frame for the Evaluation Process

Tasks	Number of working days	Tentative dates	Expected result
Desk review of project document, reports and other background documents	3	August 10 - 14	Inception report containing work plan, key findings of desk review and evaluation methodology
Development of evaluation methodology/inception report			
Comments to the Inception Report	5	August 15 - 21	
Site Visits, Meetings and interviews with stakeholders, beneficiaries and Partners; Debriefing (last day of the mission)	15	September 5 - 21	Data from major stakeholders collected
Data analysis and preparation of the draft report	3	September 26 - 28	Draft evaluation report with findings, lessons learned and results submitted to UNDP for review
Collecting comments on draft report from UNDP	8	October 1 - 10	
Finalization of the report on the basis of comments received	3	October 15 - 17	Evaluation report
<b>Total working days</b>	<b>37</b>		

**XII. Documents to be included when submitting the proposals**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their

qualifications:

1. Proposal (in English, mandatory):

(i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work

2. Financial proposal

3. P-11 UNDP Personal History Form and CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

### Financial proposal

- **Lump sum contracts:** The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

### Assessment of the proposal

- Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

#### Combined scoring method

*When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:*

*a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and*

*b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.*

*\* Technical Criteria weight; 70%*

*\* Financial Criteria weight; 30%*

*Only candidates obtaining a minimum of seventy (70) technical points would be considered for the consultancy.*

### XIII. Payment Schedule of Deliverables

1. Deliverable 1	0%	At submission and approval of inception report
2. Deliverable 2	50%	Following submission and approval of the draft final evaluation report
3. Deliverable 3	50%	Following submission and approval of the final terminal evaluation report

### XIV. ANNEX I – List of key documents and databases to consult



- Evaluation Matrix
- UNDP 2014-2017 Strategic Plan
- UNDP 2018 – 2021 Strategic Plan
- UNDP Country Programme Document (2012 – 2016 and 2017 – 2021)
- Country Programme Action Plan (2012 - 2016)
- Low Carbon Development Strategy
- Initiation Plan – ADF Phase I
- ADF Phase I Report
- Project Document – ADF Phase II
- Annual Work Plans (AWPs)
- Quarterly Progress Reports
- Field Mission Reports
- List of Target Villages/ Communities and CDPs
- The format required for the evaluation report
- Code of Conduct for UNEG evaluators

**ANNEX II: RATING SCALES**

**Rating Scales for Evaluation Criteria**

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E,	Sustainability ratings	Relevance Ratings:	Impact Ratings (if impact is evaluated):
<p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings</p> <p>2.</p>	<p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p>	<p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>			

## ANNEX III: 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 Form<sup>2</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>2</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## **ANNEX IV: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>3</sup>**

### **1. Title and opening pages**

- 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

### **2. Table of contents**

### **3. List of acronyms and abbreviations**

### **4. Executive summary**

- Brief description on the project
- Brief explanation of the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses
- evaluation approach and methodology
- summarized findings, conclusions and recommendations

### **5. Introduction**

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Project intervention
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

### **6. Description of the intervention**

- Expected results
- Link to national and programmatic priorities
- Key partners
- Scale of intervention
- Total resources
- Social, political, economic, institutional context
- Design weaknesses
- Implementation constraints

### **7. Evaluation scope and objectives**

- Evaluation scope
- Evaluation objectives
- Evaluation criteria
- Evaluation questions

### **8. Evaluation approach and methods**

- Data sources
- Sample and sampling frame
- Data collection procedures and instruments
- Performance standards
- Stakeholder engagement
- Ethical considerations
- Limitations

### **9. Data analysis**

### **10. Findings and conclusions**

---

<sup>3</sup> Please see Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results for full details

- Findings
- Conclusions

## **11. Recommendations**

## **12. Lesson learned**

## **13. Annexes**

- 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 evaluator
- Code of conduct signed by evaluator

