

# ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

## INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs), previously called “Assessment of Development Results) (ADRs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national efforts for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.<sup>1</sup> The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of IEO is two-fold: (i) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (ii) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership. Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

This is the third ICPE for Jamaica and will be conducted in 2020 towards the end of the current UNDP programme cycle of 2017-2021, with a view to contributing to the preparation of UNDP’s new programme starting from 2022. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Jamaica, UNDP Jamaica country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean.

## NATIONAL CONTEXT

Jamaica is a highly indebted upper middle-income Small Island Developing State (SIDS) located in the Caribbean with the population of almost 2.9 million<sup>2</sup>. The country’s GDP annual growth rate has been raising slowly averaging 1.9 percent in 2018 with GDP per capita reaching US\$ 5,354.2 in 2018<sup>3</sup>. Jamaica was within the medium-high classification (very close to high) of economic and social vulnerability to external shocks in 2017.<sup>4</sup> Jamaica’s Human Development Index (HDI) value for 2018 is 0.726— which put the country in the high human development category— positioning it at 96 out of 189 countries and territories. However, it is below the average of 0.750 for countries in the high human development group and below the average of 0.759 for countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.<sup>5</sup> Between 1990 and

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/evaluation-policy.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> World Bank Open Data.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid

<sup>4</sup> “Measuring Vulnerability-A Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for the Caribbean”, CDB Working Paper No. 2019/01. <https://www.caribank.org/sites/default/files/publication-resources/Measuring%20Vulnerability-A%20Multidimensional%20Vulnerability%20Index%20for%20the%20Caribbean.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Briefing note for countries on the 2019 Human Development Report: Jamaica. [http://www.hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr\\_theme/country-notes/JAM.pdf](http://www.hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/JAM.pdf)

2018, Jamaica's HDI value increased from 0.641 to 0.726, an increase of 13.2 percent. However, when the value is discounted for inequality, the HDI falls to 0.604, a loss of 16.7 percent due to inequality in the distribution of the HDI dimension indices.

The most recent survey data that were publicly available for Jamaica's Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) estimation refer to 2014. In Jamaica, 4.7 percent of the population (135 thousand people) are multidimensionally poor while an additional 6.4 percent are classified as vulnerable to multidimensional poverty (185 thousand people). The breadth of deprivation (intensity) in Jamaica, which is the average deprivation score experienced by people in multidimensional poverty, is 38.7 percent.<sup>6</sup>

Following a 2013 reform programme to stabilize the economy, reduce debt, and fuel growth, gaining national and international support, public debt fell below 100% of GDP in 2018/19 and is expected to decline below 60% by 2025/26, in line with the provisions of the Fiscal Responsibility Law. The rate of unemployment also fell to a historic low of 7.2% in October 2019, which is almost half the rate at the start of the reform programme.<sup>7</sup>

Jamaica recognizes the importance of social protection for all citizens and its influence on social stability. The 2014 Social Protection Strategy of Jamaica expressed concerns over the deteriorating poverty trends since 2008, deploring the negative impact of the socioeconomic downturn, particularly on those living below the poverty line. As a means to support Jamaica's efforts to fight poverty, the Strategy outlined a core set of social protection interventions to cover these vulnerable groups, opening the possibility for targeted social protection interventions.<sup>8</sup>

Despite sustained efforts to reduce crime, the homicide rate stood at 47 per 100,000 inhabitants in 2018— one of the highest in the region. Structural factors that contribute to crime included Jamaica's location as a trans-shipment point for internationally trafficked drugs, associated problems with gang violence and limited resources. With increasing inflows of involuntarily returned migrants (IRMs), police intelligence suggested that some IRMs were "behind the 'changing nature' of the crime being committed locally" and the National Intelligence Bureau confirms that some IRMs were prone to recidivism. More broadly, evidence suggests that, owing to their weak ties to the country and shortcomings in targeted essential services, IRMs often fall into poverty and homelessness upon returning to their country<sup>9</sup>.

Perceptions on transparency and corruption remain high. Jamaica ranks 74/100 scoring 43 in Corruption Perceptions Index in 2019<sup>10</sup>. While justice reform is under way, significant case backlogs and inefficiencies still constitute major challenges in the justice system. Inadequacies in the capacity and administration of the justice system also impact the country's efforts in combatting trafficking in persons<sup>11</sup>. Jamaica is committed to ending stigma and discrimination against people living with HIV (PLHIV). Critical to this is the ability of PLHIV to access care, support and treatment "without fear of victimization and ridicule" and to have equal access to justice<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> World Bank Open Data.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/jamaica/overview>

<sup>8</sup> Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2017-2021). The Government has allocated \$7.912 billion to the Jamaica Social Protection Strategy Programme in the 2018/19 Estimates of Expenditure (<https://jis.gov.jm/7-9-billion-social-protection-programme/>).

<sup>9</sup> Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2017-2021).

<sup>10</sup> Transparency international, Corruption Perceptions Index 2019, <https://www.transparency.org/country/JAM>

<sup>11</sup> Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2017-2021).

<sup>12</sup> Ibid

Jamaica has a Gender Inequality Index (GII) value of 0.405, ranking it 93 out of 162 countries in the 2018 index. In Jamaica, 19.0 percent of parliamentary seats are held by women, and 69.9 percent of adult women have reached at least a secondary level of education compared to 62.4 percent of their male counterparts. Female participation in the labour market is 60.4 percent compared to 73.9 for men.<sup>13</sup> Jamaica's overall gender equality score improved between 2006 and 2016, but overall, there is a mixed picture concerning health, education and other social indicators. On the one hand, high levels of life expectancy and education appear likely to offer advantages for women. On the other hand, levels of chronic disease, adolescent fertility and single household headship may impede capacities to work. Low political representation may affect the institutional and legislative environment.<sup>14</sup> In 2017, nearly 15 per cent of all women in Jamaica, aged 15 to 49, have experienced physical or sexual violence from a male partner.<sup>15</sup> A 10-year National Strategic Action Plan to Eliminate Gender-Based Violence in Jamaica (2017-2027) was launched in 2018 to prevent violence, protect and deliver adequate services to victims and deal appropriately with perpetrators.<sup>16</sup>

Jamaica has a diverse physical environment, with a wide range of microclimates, soils and physical features that support a great variety of forest types and an important refuge for long-distance migratory birds from North and Central America. Jamaica has 417 International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) red-listed species and very high levels of endemism in several vertebrate (100 percent for amphibians) and invertebrate taxa (there are over 500 endemic species of snails). The coastal zone has a variety of habitats including several large wetlands, extensive mangroves, offshore cays and coral reefs, four Ramsar sites and has high levels of biodiversity and strong ecotourism potential. Offshore, the rugged topography of the sea floor gives rise to a diverse pattern of marine environments, including deep-water trenches, coral reefs and extensive offshore banks. Coastal wetland ecosystems play an important role in maintaining shoreline stability and preserving biodiversity by functioning as a sediment trap and providing a habitat for wildlife<sup>17</sup>.

Protected areas are important storehouses of biodiversity on the island, providing important ecosystem functions and services to Jamaica's economy. Jamaica's tourism industry relies on the scenic beauty and good coastal water quality that are provided by healthy forests and wetlands. Coral reefs are of major social, economic and biophysical importance. Jamaican ecosystems also provide spill-over effects, such as strengthening sustainable livelihood opportunities (for example, by protecting water supplies and reproduction areas for valued fish species), building food and nutritional security and building resilience to the impacts of climate change, especially on coasts<sup>18</sup>.

As a small island developing state, Jamaica is vulnerable to natural hazards, particularly hurricanes, floods, droughts and earthquakes. The National Development Plan proposes strengthening the policy and regulatory frameworks for disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation and ensuring their full integration into existing frameworks at the national and local levels. While the country is over 90 per cent dependent on imported fossil fuels to meet its energy demands,

---

<sup>13</sup> Briefing note for countries on the 2019 Human Development Report: Jamaica. [http://www.hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr\\_theme/country-notes/JAM.pdf](http://www.hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/JAM.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Gender at Work in the Caribbean - Country Report: Jamaica. ILO, 2018. [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---americas/---ro-lima/---sro-port\\_of\\_spain/documents/publication/wcms\\_651948.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---americas/---ro-lima/---sro-port_of_spain/documents/publication/wcms_651948.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> <https://jis.gov.jm/nearly-15-per-cent-of-jamaican-women-experience-violence-from-a-male-partner/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://jis.gov.jm/features/action-taken-to-eliminate-gender-based-violence/>

<sup>17</sup> A Roadmap for SDG Implementation in Jamaica, Government of Jamaica, 2017

<sup>18</sup> Ibid

resulting in relatively high costs reflected in the cost per KWh (about 26 US cents) and in the amount of money that the country spends on energy, Jamaica's attempts to explore renewable energy sources need support to overcome financial and regulatory barriers<sup>19</sup>.

COVID-19 pandemic is not only a health crisis but has significant economic and social impact. The economy in Jamaica is expected to contract by over 5 percent in 2020 and government revenues are expected to decline by double digits even as emergency health expenditures as well as social and economic support expenditures rise. Considerably lower inflows from tourism and remittances which represented 20 and 15 percent of GDP prior to the pandemic will also have multi-dimensional impact. The government is implementing fiscal actions to address some of economic impact of COVID-19, including providing a \$25 billion stimulus, the largest fiscal stimulus in Jamaica's history.<sup>20</sup> The government also implemented a social and economic support programme called the *CARE Programme*, which provides assistance to vulnerable individuals and small businesses through innovative and existing delivery channels.<sup>21</sup> As of early June 2020, the Jamaica government announced that they will soon publish protocols for reopening workplace and tourism industry.<sup>22</sup>

## UNDP PROGRAMME IN JAMAICA

UNDP Jamaica is a multi-country office, which also serves Bermuda, the Bahamas, Cayman Islands, and Turks and Caicos Islands. The programme priorities captured in the 2017-2021 Country programme document support the SDGs to which Jamaica has subscribed and are anchored in the United Nations Multi-country Sustainable Development Framework (MSDF) for the Caribbean 2017-2021 and the Country Implementation Plan (CIP) for Jamaica, which seek to promote One Programme and One Common budgetary framework<sup>23</sup> and the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017. These national and sub-regional priorities were validated with 17 Caribbean Governments and are fully aligned with the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Strategic Plan (2015-2019), the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development<sup>24</sup>.

UNDP's country programme document for Jamaica identified four programme priorities for the period under review (2017-2021):

- (i) Access to equitable social protection systems and basic services: Under this priority area, UNDP plans to support implementation of the national social protection strategy, through capacity strengthening of key government and civil society institutions to deliver social protection and basic services, especially targeting the most vulnerable groups. In an effort to target the most critical areas, UNDP also plans to support the Government in improving its poverty-measurement methodologies.

---

<sup>19</sup> Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2017-2021).

<sup>20</sup> <https://mof.gov.jm/mof-media/media-centre/press/2633-fiscal-stimulus-response-to-the-covid-19.html>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2020/05/27/na052720-jamaica-ramps-up-social-and-economic-support-in-covid-19-response>

<sup>22</sup> <https://jis.gov.jm/jamaica-and-the-coronavirus/>

<sup>23</sup> Ibid

<sup>24</sup> Ibid

- (ii) Democratic governance, citizen’s security and safety: Under this priority area, UNDP plans to support justice reform, institutional capacity strengthening to prevent violence, particularly against girls and women, to combat trafficking in person. UNDP also aims to support the mainstreaming of gender into national policies and legislation, the establishment of a national human rights institution and strategies to reduce the incidence stigma and discrimination against people living with HIV/AIDS.
- (iii) Resilience to climate change and natural disasters and universal access to clean energy: UNDP plans to offer an innovative, integrated pilot programme on sustainable cities, to support national institutions in adopting best practices for climate change adaptation, promoting understanding of climate change, facilitating knowledge transfer and developing financing mechanisms to access funds for climate change adaptation and mitigation as well as in improving policy and institutional framework for the energy sector.
- (iv) Natural resource management: This includes support to strengthen the policy and regulatory frameworks for natural resource management and the integration of environmental issues into economic and social decision-making, for example supporting the development of a rain-water harvesting policy to promote the sustainable management of water resources, or supporting the operationalization and capitalization of the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica and the development of the minerals industry.

The programme approaches of the current country programme document are centered on institutional strengthening to effect positive changes in the above priority areas, through South-South Cooperation, policy research and advocacy and facilitation of citizen participation as an enabler for change.

The MSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in, UNDP programme outputs and indicative resources are summarized in the following table:

<b>Table 1: MSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in, UNDP programme outputs and indicative resources (2017-2021)</b>			
<b>UNSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in and UNDP country programme outputs</b>		<b>Indicative resources (US\$ thousands)</b>	
		<b>Regular resources</b>	<b>Other resources</b>
Outcome 1: Access to equitable social protection systems, quality services and improved sustainable economic opportunities	Output 1.1. Options enabled and facilitated for inclusive and sustainable social protection Output 1.2: National development plans and strategies address poverty and inequality for sustainability and risk resilience Output 1.3: Global and national data collection, measurement and analytical systems in place to monitor progress on the post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals Output 1.4: Functions, financing and capacity of subnational-level institutions enabled to deliver	800	800

	improved basic services and respond to priorities voiced by the public		
<b>Total outcome 1</b>		<b>1,600</b>	
Outcome 2: Capacities of public policy and rule of law institutions and civil society organizations strengthened	Output 2.1: Technical capacities of human rights institutions and civil society organizations strengthened Output 2.2: Measures in place and implemented across sectors to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV)	250	3,000
<b>Total outcome 2</b>		<b>3,250</b>	
Outcome 3: Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place	Output 3.1: Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and access to renewable/alternative energy Output 3.2: Scaled-up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors facilitated Output 3.3: Gender-responsive disaster and climate risk management is integrated into the development planning and budgeted frameworks of key sectors	400	10,100
<b>Total outcome 3</b>		<b>10,500</b>	
Outcome 4: Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration and use of ecosystems and natural resources	Output 4.1: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation Output 4.2: Solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste	300	4,530
<b>Total outcome 4</b>		<b>4,840</b>	
<b>Grand total</b>		<b>20,180</b>	

Source: UNDP Jamaica Country Programme Document 2017-2021

## SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme in order to feed into the process of developing the new country programme. The ICPE will focus on the present programme cycle (2017-2021) while taking into account interventions which may have started in the previous programme cycle (2012 - 2016) but continued for a few more years into the current programme cycle.

As a country-level evaluation of UNDP, the ICPE will focus on the formal UNDP country programme approved by the Executive Board but will also consider any changes from the initial CPD during the period under review, including, for example, changes to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. The ICPE covers interventions funded by all sources of finance, core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds, etc. It is important to note that a UNDP country office may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these “non-project” activities may be crucial for advancing the political and social agenda of a country.

Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of UNV through undertaking joint work with UNDP. This information will be used for synthesis in order to provide corporate level evaluative evidence of performance of the associated programme.

## METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.<sup>25</sup> The ICPE will address the following three main evaluation questions.<sup>26</sup> These questions will also guide the presentation of the evaluation findings in the report.

1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP’s performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?

To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate, to better understand how and under what conditions UNDP’s interventions are expected to lead to democratic governance, enhanced basic services, better natural resources management and strengthened resilience in the country. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme’s desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes.

As part of this analysis, the progression of the programme over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD’s progression, UNDP’s capacity to adapt to the changing context in Jamaica (including changes to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, etc.) and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at.

---

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>

<sup>26</sup> The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria. More detailed sub-questions will be developed during the desk review phase of the evaluation.

As mentioned above, Jamaica country programme is anchored in the MSDF for the Caribbean. In this regard, the evaluation will also look into the functioning of the multi-country system and how it influences the development of individual country programme.

The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analyzed in response to evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved results and the extent to which these results have contributed to the intended CPD objectives and responded to the Government's priorities. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect as well as unintended results will be identified.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that influenced - positively or negatively - UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results in the country will be examined in response to evaluation question 3. In addition to country-specific factors that may explain UNDP's performance, the utilization of resources to deliver results (including managerial practices), the extent to which the CO fostered partnerships and synergies with other actors (including through south-south and triangular cooperation), the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment in design and implementation of the CPD, and the functioning of a multi-country office, are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.


## DATA COLLECTION

**Assessment of existing data and data collection constraints.** An assessment was carried out for each outcome area to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints, to determine the data collection needs and methods. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available. The assessment indicated that there were only 2 decentralized evaluations undertaken during the period from 2017 to present, which were all project evaluations. Both evaluations were quality-assessed by IEO: one report was rated as satisfactory (rating of 5), and the other was rated as moderately satisfactory (rating of 4). These evaluations will serve as inputs into the ICPE. Jamaica is also one of the country case studies undertaken for the corporate evaluation on UNDP's development cooperation in middle income countries, and the data collected for the country case study will also serve as inputs into this ICPE. The majority of projects have project documents, and some annual progress reports are available. Overall, the programme has sufficient information to conduct the ICPE.

With respect to indicators, the CPD list 15 indicators for the 4 outcome results, and 20 indicators to measure the 11 outputs, with baseline and targets. To the extent possible, the ICPE will seek to use these indicators to better understand the intention of the UNDP programme and to measure or assess progress towards the outcomes. The indicators mostly indicated national statistics, and reports of various ministries as data sources, and the evaluation's ability to measure progress against these indicators will therefore depend on national statistical capacities, including the periodicity of the national data system and the availability of disaggregated data by age, sex, geographic area, etc. In cases where the indicators are set at national level, the evaluation will assess the linkages between UNDP's specific interventions and the indicators established and the extent to which changes in these indicators could be influenced by UNDP work.

It is also important to note that UNDP projects that contributed to different outcomes are at different stages of implementation, and therefore it may not always be possible to determine the projects' contribution to results. In cases where the projects/initiatives are still in their initial stages, the evaluation





will document observable progress and seek to ascertain the possibility of achieving the outcome given the programme design and measures already put in place.

Regarding field work, while a field mission is generally part of the country programme evaluation approach, the current COVID-19 situation might impact the feasibility of such a mission. The evaluation team will work closely with the CO and confirmation of the field mission and dates will be subject to the evolution of the situation. In the likely event that no mission is possible, the evaluation team will undertake remote data collection, meeting with CO staff and stakeholders virtually through various platforms including Skype, Zoom or telephone. The evaluation team will also consider collaborating with national think-tanks, academia or other locally-based institutions in the conduct of the evaluation to help fill data gaps and strengthen the analysis.

**Data collection methods:** The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of documentation and information and interviews with key informants, including beneficiaries, partners and managers. Where available and relevant, GIS satellite imagery data will also be considered. An advance questionnaire will be administered to the country office before primary data collection. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus group discussions may be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

The selection of projects for in-depth reviews will be based on the following criteria. The coverage should include all outcome areas, and should include a sample, as relevant, of both successful projects and projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned, both larger and smaller pilot projects, as well as both completed and active projects.

The IEO and the country office have identified an initial list of background and programme-related documents which is posted on an ICPE SharePoint website. The following secondary data will be reviewed, among others: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports; and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners.

In line with UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all of UNDP Jamaica programmes and operations. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

**Validation.** The evaluation will use triangulation of information collected from different sources and/or by different methods to enhance the validity of findings.

**Stakeholder involvement:** A participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with multiple stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the initial phase a stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, and to examine any potential partnerships that could further improve UNDP's contribution to the country.

## MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

**Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP:** The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Jamaica Country Office, the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Government of Jamaica. The IEO Lead Evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

**UNDP Country Office in Jamaica:** The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders and ensure that all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country is available to the team, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team in-kind organizational support (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries; assistance for project site visits). To ensure the independence of the views expressed, country office staff will not participate in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes. The country office will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a videoconference with the IEO, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the country office will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

**UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC):** RBLAC will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

**Evaluation Team:** The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. The IEO will ensure gender balance and will include the following members:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for managing the ICPE, including preparing for and designing the evaluation (i.e. the present ToR) as well as selecting the evaluation team and providing methodological guidance. The LE will be responsible for the synthesis process and the preparation of the draft and final evaluation reports. The LE will be backstopped by another evaluator also from the IEO.
- **Associate Evaluator (AE):** The AE will support the LE in the preparation and design of the evaluation, including background research and documentation, the selection of the evaluation team, and the synthesis process. The AE will review the draft report and support the LE in other aspects of the ICPE process as may be required.
- **Consultants:** Up to 2 consultants will be recruited and will be responsible for the outcome areas. Under the guidance of LE, they will conduct preliminary research and data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE report. UNDP will also explore the possibility of engaging a local institution/think tank for certain analysis where suited.

The roles of the different members of the evaluation team can be summarized in Table 2.

<b>Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome areas</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Report</b>	<b>Data collection</b>
Social protection and basic services (outcome 1)	Consultant/LE	Consultant/LE
Democratic governance, citizen security and safety (outcome 2)	Consultant/LE	Consultant/LE
Resilience and clean energy (outcome 3)	Consultant/ALE	Consultant/ALE
Natural resources management (outcome 4)	Consultant/ALE	Consultant/ALE
General strategic and management issues	LE/ALE	LE/ALE/consultant

## **EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute the framework for conducting the evaluation.

**Phase 1: Preparatory work.** The IEO prepares the ToR and the evaluation design, including an overall evaluation matrix. Once the TOR is approved, additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals will be recruited. The IEO starts collecting data and documentation internally first and then filling data gaps with help from the UNDP country office.

**Phase 2: Desk analysis.** Evaluation team members will conduct desk review of reference material, and identify specific evaluation questions, and issues. Further in-depth data collection will be conducted, by administering an advance questionnaire and interviews (via phone, Skype, etc.) with key stakeholders, including country office staff. Based on this, detailed evaluation questions, gaps and issues that require validation during the field-based phase of the data collection will be identified.

**Phase 3: Primary data collection.** The feasibility of a field mission will largely depend on the evolution of the COVID-19 situation. If the situation does not evolve positively in the coming months, a field mission might not be feasible and in that case, the evaluation team will undertake remote primary data collection, through telephone, Skype and virtual conferences with CO staff and management, key government stakeholders and other partners and beneficiaries. The evaluation team will also consider collaborating with a local research entity to help fill data gaps and strengthen the analysis.

**Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief.** Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The draft will first be subject to peer review by IEO and its external reviewers. Once the draft is quality cleared, it will be circulated to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any necessary additional corrections will be made and the UNDP Jamaica country office will prepare the management response to the ICPE, under the overall oversight of the regional bureau.

The report will then be shared at a final virtual debriefing where the results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders. The way forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater

ownership by national stakeholders with respect to the recommendations as well as to strengthening accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the evaluation report will be finalized and published.

**Phase 5: Publication and dissemination.** The ICPE report will be written in English. It will follow the standard IEO publication guidelines. The ICPE report will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board by the time of approving a new Country Programme Document. It will be widely distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Jamaica country office and the Government of Jamaica will disseminate to stakeholders in the country. The report, which includes the management response, will be published on the UNDP website<sup>27</sup> as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.<sup>28</sup>

### TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively<sup>29</sup> as follows in Table 3:

<b>Table 3: Tentative timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in June 2021</b>		
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Responsible party</b>	<b>Proposed timeframe</b>
<b>Phase 1: Preparatory work</b>		
TOR completed and approved by IEO Director	LE	June 2020
Selection of consultant team members	LE	July/August 2020
Notification and Identification of the institutions & partners to be met	LE/CO	July/August 2020
<b>Phase 2: Desk analysis</b>		
Preliminary desk review of reference material	Evaluation team	June/July 2020
Advance questionnaires to the CO	LE/ALE/CO	July 2020
<b>Phase 3: Primary data collection</b>		
Mission to Jamaica if possible or remote data collection	LE/ALE/Consultants	August/September 2020
<b>Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, review and debrief</b>		
Analysis of data and submission of background papers	Consultants	September 2020
Synthesis and report writing	LE/ALE	October 2020
Zero draft for IEO clearance	LE	November 2020
First draft to CO/RBLAC for comments	LE/CO/RBLAC	December 2020
Second draft shared with the government, key donors and national stakeholders	LE/CO/GOV	January 2021
Draft management response	CO	January 2021
Stakeholder workshop via video-conference	IEO/CO/RBLAC	January/February 2021
<b>Phase 5: Publication and dissemination</b>		
Editing and formatting	IEO	February 2021
Final report and evaluation brief	IEO	February 2021
Dissemination of the final report	IEO	March 2021

<sup>27</sup> [web.undp.org/evaluation](http://web.undp.org/evaluation)

<sup>28</sup> [erc.undp.org](http://erc.undp.org)

<sup>29</sup> The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.