

An abstract graphic at the top of the page consisting of a dark blue background with a network of thin white lines connecting various colored dots (yellow, blue, orange, white) scattered across the space, resembling a data network or a stylized city skyline.

Independent Country Programme Evaluation:

Jamaica

Annexes



Contents

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE	2
ANNEX 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	14
ANNEX 3. PEOPLE CONSULTED	17
ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	21
ANNEX 5. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN (CPAP) OUTCOME INDICATORS	26
ANNEX 6. PROJECT LIST	31

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.¹ 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 million². 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 2018³. Jamaica was within the medium-high classification (very close to high) of economic and social vulnerability to external shocks in 2017.⁴ 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.⁵ Between 1990 and

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

² World Bank Open Data.

³ Ibid

⁴ “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>.

⁵ 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

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.⁶

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.⁷

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.⁸

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 country⁹.

Perceptions on transparency and corruption remain high. Jamaica ranks 74/100 scoring 43 in Corruption Perceptions Index in 2019¹⁰. 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 persons¹¹. 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 justice¹².

⁶ World Bank Open Data.

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

⁸ 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/>).

⁹ Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2017-2021).

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

¹¹ Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2017-2021).

¹² 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.¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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 wildlife¹⁷.

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 coasts¹⁸.

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,

¹³ 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

¹⁴ 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

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

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

¹⁷ A Roadmap for SDG Implementation in Jamaica, Government of Jamaica, 2017

¹⁸ 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 barriers¹⁹.

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.²⁰ 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.²¹ As of early June 2020, the Jamaica government announced that they will soon publish protocols for reopening workplace and tourism industry.²²

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 framework²³ 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 Development²⁴.

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.

¹⁹ Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2017-2021).

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

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

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

²³ Ibid

²⁴ 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:

Table 1: MSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in, UNDP programme outputs and indicative resources (2017-2021)			
UNSDF outcomes which UNDP is involved in and UNDP country programme outputs		Indicative resources (US\$ thousands)	
		Regular resources	Other resources
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		
Total outcome 1		1,600	
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
Total outcome 2		3,250	
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
Total outcome 3		10,500	
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
Total outcome 4		4,840	
Grand total		20,180	

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.²⁵ The ICPE will address the following three main evaluation questions.²⁶ 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.

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

²⁶ 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.

Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome areas		
Outcome	Report	Data collection
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 website²⁷ 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.²⁸

TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively²⁹ as follows in Table 3:

Table 3: Tentative timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in June 2021		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
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
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary desk review of reference material	Evaluation team	June/July 2020
Advance questionnaires to the CO	LE/ALE/CO	July 2020
Phase 3: Primary data collection		
Mission to Jamaica if possible or remote data collection	LE/ALE/Consultants	August/September 2020
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, review and debrief		
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
Phase 5: Publication and dissemination		
Editing and formatting	IEO	February 2021
Final report and evaluation brief	IEO	February 2021
Dissemination of the final report	IEO	March 2021

²⁷ web.undp.org/evaluation

²⁸ erc.undp.org

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

ANNEX 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Evaluation Questions	Sub-questions	Data/Info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)	Data analysis (e.g.)
EQ1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?	1.1 What are UNDP's outcomes as defined in the CPD?	UNDP's specific areas of work and approaches for contribution under CPD/UNDAF outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk/literature review of relevant documents (including problem analysis conducted by the CO) • Semi-structured interviews/focus groups with relevant stakeholders • Field studies/visits to beneficiaries • Survey(s) to cover gaps or validate preliminary findings • Other as appropriate 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Map a theory of change to identify the logic, sequence of events and assumptions behind the proposed programme 2. Problem analysis of underlying development challenges 3. Stakeholders analysis 4. SMART analysis of CPD indicators 5. Triangulate data collected from various sources and means (e.g. cross check interview data with desk review to validate or refute TOC).
	1.2 If there have been any changes to the programme design and implementation from the initial CPD, what were they, and why were the changes made?	<p>UNDP's interventions strategy, e.g. theory of change that maps an expected pathway of change, logic and assumptions; including plans detailing required financial resources and capacity for programme implementation (and evidence of their provision)</p> <p>Evidence of design tailored to meeting development challenges and emerging needs of the country</p>		

ICPE Evaluation Matrix (as of 1 Feb 2018. Rev 2)³⁰

³⁰ This matrix represents a generic model for ICPEs. Specific matrices should be developed for individual countries during a design phase, reflecting their unique country context and data collection/analysis requirements.

EQ2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?	2.1 To what extent and with which results did UNDP achieve its specific objectives (CP outputs) as defined in the CPD and other strategies (if different)?	Progress towards achievement of intended objectives (including a list of indicators chosen for the CPD and those used for corporate reporting, baselines, targets; and status)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk/literature review of relevant documents • Code in NVivo ROARs, GRES as well as indicators status to assess progress and trends • Project QA data extraction • Semi-structured interviews/focus groups with relevant stakeholders • Field studies/visits to beneficiaries • Survey(s) to cover gaps or validate preliminary findings • Other as appropriate 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contribution analysis against TOC assumptions; 2. Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP 3. Analysis of evaluations and audits; 4. Summary of outcome indicator and status 5. Analysis of corporate surveys 6. Trend analysis of ROARs & GRES 7. Triangulate data collected from various sources and means.
	2.2 To what extent did the achieved results contribute to the outcome?	Clear linkages between UNDP's specific interventions and UNDAF-defined outcome level changes		
	2.3 Were there positive or negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes?	Evidence of contribution to GEWE Evidence of contributions to the SDGs		
EQ3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?	3.1 What programme design and implementation-related factors have contributed to or hindered results?	Key factors affecting the results ³¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project QA data extraction • Semi-structured interviews/focus groups with relevant stakeholders - focus on validating or refuting lines of inquiry - collecting perceptions and observations on the "why" and factors that influence or impede effectiveness; 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of a template of 'factors' with analysis of 'strength of influence (extent the factors affect UNDP's ability to achieve its objectives)' 2. Contribution analysis against TOC assumptions; 3. Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP
	3.2 How have the key principles of the Strategic Plan been applied to the country programme design ³²	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Programme design (incl. alignment with national priorities, mix of up/downstream interventions, short/long term, evidence-based, ToC/workplans) 2. Partnerships 		

³¹ See the factor assessment sheet for the 'working definition' of the factor typology.

³² As the CPDs under review may be based on the previous Strategic Plan (2014-2017), we should select a set of key principles reflected in both old and new Strategic Plan for our purpose, to examine how they have been reflected in programme design and used to enhance the results). For example, in the **new Strategic Plan 2018-2021**, the key issues include: (1) 'Working in partnership': i) Within UN System; and ii) Outside UNS (South-South; civil society; private sector; and IFIs); (2) 'Helping to achieve the 2030 Agenda'; (3) '6 Signature Solutions': i) Keeping people out of poverty; ii) Strengthen effective, accountable, inclusive governance; iii) enhance prevention and recovery for resilient society; iv) promote nature-based solutions for sustainable plant; v) close the energy gap; and vi) strengthen gender equality; (4) 'Improved business models (Performance; and Innovation)

Questions	Sub-questions	Data/Info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)	Data analysis (e.g.)
	3.3 What mechanisms were put in place at the design and implementation stage to ensure the sustainability of results, given the identifiable risks?	3. Knowledge management, use of lessons learned, including South-South and Triangular Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field studies/visits to beneficiaries • Spot check status of implementation of recommendations from previous ADR/ICPE • Tabulation of corporate surveys data • Survey(s) to cover gaps or validate preliminary findings • Other as appropriate 	4. Analysis of evaluations and audits; 5. Analysis of corporate surveys 6. Trend analysis of ROARs & GRES 7. Cross-check interview data with desk review to validate or refute lines of inquiry – highlighting data on the “why” and factors that influence or impede effectiveness; (check for unintended outcomes); 8. Triangulate data from desk review and interviews with survey to close gaps and findings
	3.4 How did UNDP design to scale up coverage and efforts of its interventions (including scaling-up of pilot activities)? ³³	4. Sustainability (incl. exit strategies, national ownership, piloting and scaling-up) 5. Social & Environment Standards’ (incl. human rights, GEWE, environment sustainability, targeting) 6. Resources (incl. efficiency) 7. Implementation and oversight (incl. NIM/DIM, portfolio management, risk management, flexibility, M&E)		

Sources:

1. CPD and other CO strategy documents; 2. UNDP Strategic Plans; 3. Gender-related material (e.g. CO gender strategy; Gender Seal data; Gender Marker; HR parity data; GRES data); 4. Executive Snapshot - financial data; 5. Corporate surveys; 6. Partnership-related material (e.g. CO partnership strategy; South-South; donor relations; UNDAF; List of existing and potential UNDP partners and status of their engagements; Partnership survey); 7. ROARs and Project Quality assurance data (‘management & monitoring’); 8. Minutes of consultations with Gov, UNDPs, private sector, academia, donors, beneficiaries; 9. Past CO/donor evaluation and audit reports; 10. IEO surveys; 11. National development strategies; 12. Past ADR recommendations; 13. Stakeholders (Gov’t, CO, UN agencies, donors, beneficiary groups, IFIs); 14 Experts (UNDP sector policy advisors; think tanks; academia)

³³ See the UNDP Guidance Note on Scaling-Up Development Programmes (2013)

ANNEX 3. PEOPLE CONSULTED

Government

First Name	Last Name	Function	Institution
Ainsworth	Carroll	Director Planning, Projects, Monitoring, Evaluation & Research	National Environment and Planning Agency
Aisha	Bedasse	Manager	National Environmental & Planning Agency
Andrade	Sinclair	CEO	May Pen Hospital-St
Anthony	McKenzie	Director – Environmental Management and Conservation	National Environment and Planning Agency
Barbara	Scott	Deputy Director, External Cooperation Management Division	Planning Institute of Jamaica
Bethune	Morgan	Manager, Pollution Prevention Branch	National Environment and Planning Agency
Carl Francis	Smith	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Disaster Preparedness, Management & Reconstruction Nassau
Craig G.	Delancy	Deputy Director of Public Works	Ministry of Public Works
Daveen	Sinclair	Policy Analyst, Diversion & Reintegration	Ministry of National Security
Delores	Wade	Manager	Planning Institute of Jamaica
Edison	Galbraith	General Manager	Development Bank of Jamaica
Gillian	Guthrie	Chief Technical Director	Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation
Graceann	Stewart-McFarlane	Chief Technical Director	Ministry of Justice
Gregory	Thomas	Senior Manager- Projects	National Environment and Planning Agency
Horace	Buckley	Director of Projects	Ministry of Science, Energy and Technology
Jacqueline	Ellis	CEO	National Chest & Sir John Golding Health Facilities
John-Michael	Clarke	Chairman	Bahamas Reconstruction Authority
Kadeish	Fletcher		Court Administration Division
Karen A.	Campbell-Bascoe	Director	Justice Training Institute
Kathleen	Forbes		Ministry of Finance
Kenisha	Hudson	Community Development Manager	Social Development Commission
Leslie	James	Director of Projects	Ministry of Health
Marsha	Henry-Martin	Permenent Secretary	Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development
Newton	Douglas	Director, Policy Planning and Evaluation	Child Protection and Family Services Agency
Omar	Alcock	Mitigation Specialist	Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation
Oral	Rainford	Principal Director, Mining and Minerals Policy,	Ministry of Transport and Mining
Peisha	Bryan-Lee	Programme Director	Planning Institute of Jamaica

Rochelle	Dixon		Child Protection and Family Services Agency
Roger	Smith	Director	National Works Agency
Rosalee	Gage-Grey	Chief Executive Officer	Child Protection and Family Services Agency
Roy	Nicholson	Commissioner of Mines and Geology	Mines and Geology Division
Seveline	Collins	Senior Economist	Planning Institute of Jamaica
Tracey-Ann	Smith	Policy Analyst	Jamaica Tertiary Education Commission
Tricia	Cameron-Anglin		Court Administration Division
Una	May Gordon	Principal Director	Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation
Virginia I.	Clerveaux	Director	Department of Disaster Management and Emergencies
Vivian K.	Blake	Project Manager, National Ozone Unit/National	National Environment and Planning Agency
Wendell	Grant		Disaster reconstruction agency

Civil Society Organization

First Name	Last Name	Function	Institution
Andrew	Meyer	Program Manager	Global Emergency Relief Recovery & Reconstruction
Anjuline	Green	Vice President	National Organization of Deported Migrants
David	Allen	President	Fletchers Land Benevolent Society
Dean	Corrodus		Western Jamaica Mining & Quarrying Association
Emile	Leiba		Jamaican Bar Association
Eurica	Douglas	General Manager	Clarendon Parish Development Committee Benevolent Society
Gloria	Goffe	Executive Director	Combined Disabilities Association
Harold	Davis	Deputy CEO	Jamaica Business Development Corporation
Hugh	Dixon		St Elizabeth Environmental Agency
Judith	Wedderburn		Women's Media Watch
Mathew	Aubry		Organisation for Responsible Governance
Noel	McKenzie	Director	Mining & Quarrying Association
Rodje	Malcolm		Jamaicans for Justice
Ruth	Jankee	Executive Director	Rose Town Foundation for the Built Environment
Samba Idrissa	SIDIBE		CORE - Bahamas
Stacey	Plummer	Deputy Commissioner	Women in Mining Group
Will	Tomlinson		Idea Relief

Private Sector

First Name	Last Name	Function	Institution
Bob	Maher		S&G Limestone Limited
Dana	Baugh	Managing Director	Baughaus Studios Ltd
Egbert	Hamilton		Stone Boss
Garfield	Williams		Trench Town Ceramic and Art Centre
Jackie	Millington	Quality Manager, Director	Lydford Mining Company Ltd
Michelle	Shaw		Shaw's Quarry Ltd
Paul	Luelim	Engineering Consultant	PowerGen Ltd

UNDP and other International Organizations

First Name	Last Name	Function	Institution
Alicia	Bowen-McCluskie		UNDP
Ava	Whyte-Anderson	Programme Analyst	UNDP
Bart	Tilkin	Regional Portfolio Manager	UNV
Bernadette	Theodore-Gandi	RR	PAHO/WHO
Deborah	Duperly-Pinks	Senior Development Officer	Canada High Commission Development Cooperation
Denise	Antonio	Resident Representative	UNDP
Etoile	Pinder	Project Coordinator, Bahamas Recovery Project	UNDP
Eva	Huttova	Programme Analyst	UNDP
Gabrio	Marinozzi		European Union
Garry	Conille	RC	UN Resident Coordinator's Office
George	Abualzulof	Senior Human Rights Advisor	OHCHR
Gillian	Scott	Communications Analyst	UNDP
Hyacinth	Douglas	GEF-SGP National Coordinator	UNDP
Itziar	Gonzalez	Chief of Business Solutions & Operations	UNDP
Itziar	Laurence-Chounoune	former RR	UNDP
Jacinda	Fairholm	Programme Specialist	UNDP
Jeffrey	James	Programme Assistant	UNDP
Keisha	Livermore	Head of Office	International Organization for Migration
Kenisha	Thom	Procurement Analyst	UNDP
Kerry-Ann	Willis	Policy Associate	UNDP
Kimberley	Wilson	M&E	UNDP
Lincoln	Campbell		UNDSS
Lorna	Inniss	Coordinator, Cartagena Convention Secretariat, Ecosystems Division	UNEP

Mariko	Kagoshima	Representative	UNICEF
Marjolaine	Cote	Funding Windows Fund Manager	UNDP
Morgan Lea	Murray	Development Coordination Officer	UN Resident Coordinator's Office
Ozan	Sevimli	Resident Representative for Jamaica and Guyana	World Bank
Richard	Kelly	Policy Specialist	UNDP
Ruth	Clarke	Country Co-ordinator, Jamaica, ACP - EU Development Minerals Programme	UNDP
Saadia	Sanchez	RR	UNESCO
Sasha	Shirley	Operations Analyst	UNDP
Seth	Broekman	Deputy Director, Sub-regional Office for the Caribbean	UNFPA
Sharona	Napier	Programme Associate	UNDP
Stacy Ann	Thomlinson	Policy Associate	UNDP
Stefano	Cilli	European Union Attache	European Union
Tania	Chambers	Project manager	Canada High Commission Development Cooperation
Tenny	Daley	GEF5 Project Manager	UNDP
Tonni Ann	Brodber	Representative, UN Women Multi-Country Office- Caribbean	UN Women
Vicente	Teran	Deputy Representative	UNICEF
Vincent	Sweeney	Head of Sub-regional Office	UNEP

Academia

First Name	Last Name	Function	Institution
Aldrie	Henry Lee	Director	SALISES, UWI
Laurence	Neufville	Dean, Faculty of Built Environment	University of Technology
Sherene	James-Williamson	Senior Lecturer, Geology and Geography Department	University of the West Indies (UWI, Mona)

ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

In addition to the documents named below, the evaluation team reviewed project documents, annual project reports, midterm review reports, final evaluation reports and other project documents. The websites of many related organizations were also searched, including those of UN organizations, Jamaican governmental departments, project management offices and others.

Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI), 2018, An economic assessment of a deposit return scheme for PET bottles, CAPRI 2018

Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI), 2019, Beyond PET bottles and plastic bags, CAPRI 2019

Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI), 2019, Managing plastic wastes – plastic bags, CAPRI 2019

Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using an integrated approach – Project Document

Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI), 2017, Economic Value of the Jamaican Diaspora, Successfully Engaging the Diaspora, Caribbean Policy Research Institute of the University of West Indies, May 2017

Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI), 2019, The Economic and Societal Costs of Sexuality-Based Discrimination in Jamaica, Caribbean Policy Research Institute of the University of West Indies, October 2019

Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI), 10 Things you need to know about crime and violence in Jamaica, Caribbean Policy Research Institute of the University of West Indies

Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI), 2019, Zero Murders: Searching for Lessons from Two decades of Anti-Violence Interventions in August Town, Caribbean Policy Research Institute of the University of West Indies, September 2019

Caribbean study visit report by Rashida Manjoo, (former) United Nations Special Rapporteur on violence against women, November 2016

Corporate Governance Framework for Public Bodies in Jamaica, September 2011

Country Programme Action Plan Between the Government of Jamaica and UNDP, 2012 to 2016

Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020, Jamaica, Annual Report

Gender Aware Beneficiary Assessment of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Service Delivery System for Northern Clarendon and West Kingston, Smith, Ianthe and Watson-Williams, Carol, March 2020

Government of Jamaica, 2015 Climate Change Policy Framework for Jamaica, 2015

Government of Jamaica, 2017 National Policy on Poverty and National Poverty Reduction Programme

Government of Jamaica, 2019, National Water Sector Policy and Implementation 2019

Government of Jamaica, 2017, National Policy on Environment Management Systems

Government of Jamaica, 2019, National Forest Management and Conservation Plan

Government of Jamaica, 2019, National Water Sector Policy and Implementation 2019

Government of Jamaica, UNDP, 2017, A Roadmap for SDG Implementation in Jamaica

Government of Jamaica / United Nations Jamaica, Joint National Steering Committee for the United Nations Multi Country Sustainable Development Framework 2017-2012, Terms of Reference

Government of Jamaica, Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation, National Policy on Poverty National Poverty Reduction Programme, Green Paper, December 2016

High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, Eradicating Poverty & Promoting Prosperity in a Changing World, Mission Report, 2017

Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 72/279 on *Repositioning of the UN Development System*, Information Note, Executive Board of UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS – Annual Session 2019

Improving Local Governance in Jamaica, Professor Rosalea Hamilton Director, National Integrity Action, Strengthening Accountability through Fiscal Transparency Practices & 2nd Co-creation Meeting: Citizen Participation Toolkit Hyatt Regency Hotel, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad & Tobago September 6-7, 2017

Institute for Gender and Development Studies, Integrated Trafficking in Persons Information System and Database, Final Report 2015

IaDB, 2018, Development Challenges in Jamaica, Country Department Caribbean Group, Policy Brief, No IDB-PB-278, IDB, May 2018.

Jamaica Human Development Indicators, Human Development Reports, UNDP, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/JAM>

J-FLAG, 2020, Annual Country Status Update on the human rights situation faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons in Jamaica, August 2020

Leave no One Behind: Report After the United Nations Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework (UN MSDF) Strategic Planning Retreat, February 2016

Ministry of National Security, Jamaica, Deportation Standard Operating Procedures: Jamaica, 2019-2024

Ministry of National Security Jamaica, National Deportation Policy: Jamaica, draft v.2, 2019-2030

Ministry of water and housing, Jamaica Water Sector Policy – Strategies and Action Plans 2019

Planning Institute of Jamaica, 2009, Vision 2030, PIOJ 2009

Planning Institute of Jamaica, Jamaica Social Protection Strategy, July 2014

Planning Institute of Jamaica, Jamaica Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, June 2018

Planning Institute of Jamaica and the Statistical Institute of Jamaica, Mapping Poverty Indicators: Consumption based poverty in Jamaica, April 2019

STATIN, 2016, Climate Change Statistics, STATIN 2016

STATIN, 2019, Demographic Statistics, 2018, Statistical Institute of Jamaica, 2019

STATIN, 2018, Measuring Growth in the Jamaican Economy, Media Briefing, August 2018

STATIN, National Statistical System Assessment Jamaica, Statistical Institute of Jamaica

Thomas-Hope, Elizabeth, Kinlocke, Robert, Ferguson, Therese, Heslop, Charmaine, Timmers, Thomas And Beth, 2017, The Urban Food System of Kingston, Jamaica, Hungry Cities Report No.4, 2017.

Transforming Citizen Security – A YAAD, Executive Summaries, Caribbean Policy Research Institute

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

UNDP Jamaica – Annual Report 2017

UNDP Jamaica – Country Programme Document 2017 – 2021

UNDP Jamaica, Multi Country Office in Jamaica, 2019, Annual Report

UNDP Jamaica – CPAP 2012 – 2016

UNDP Jamaica Communications Strategy, Draft, 2017, June 2017, Revised February 2018

UNDP Jamaica, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

UNDP Jamaica Resource Mobilization and Partnership Strategy, Draft 2020 – 2023

UNDP Jamaica, Theory of Change

UNDP, Beyond Recovery: Towards 2030, UNDP, 2020

UNDP, Audit of UNDP Country Office in Jamaica 2015

UNDP, Audit of UNDP Country Office in Jamaica 2018

UNDP, Audit of UNDP Country Office in Jamaica 2019

UNDP Jamaica, Communications Strategy UNDP 2017-2018

UNDP Jamaica Draft Gender Equality Strategy 2016 – 2021

UNDP Jamaica Draft Resource Mobilization Strategy 2020-2023

UNDP Jamaica, Results Oriented Annual Report 2017

UNDP Jamaica, Results Oriented Annual Report 2018

UNDP Jamaica, Results Oriented Annual Report 2019

UNDP Jamaica, Mini ROAR Jamaica on Covid-19

UNDP Strategic Plan 2008 – 2011

UNDP Strategic Plan 2014 – 2017

UNDP Strategic Plan 2018 – 2021

UNDP, 2019 Inequalities in Human Development in the 21st Century, Briefing note for countries on the 2019 Human Development Report, Human Development Report 2019

UNDP, 2020, Social and economic impact of the Covid-19 and policy options for Jamaica, by Manuel Mera, Research Associate, Center for Economic Distribution, Labor and Social Studies (CEDLAS), UNDP LAC C19 PDS No.9, May 2020

UNDP, 2018, Study on Involuntarily Returned Migrants (IRMs) in Jamaica

UNDP, 2015, Where are the Women? A Study of Women, Politics, Parliaments and Equality in the CARICOM Countries, Jamaica Case Study, UNDP Regional Centre Panama, 2015

UNDP IEO, Assessment of Development Results, Evaluation of UNDP Contribution, Jamaica, United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office, 2011


UNDP IEO, Assessment of Development Results, Evaluation of UNDP Contribution, Jamaica, United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office, 2004

UNDP IEO, Outcome Level Evaluations: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results for Programme Units and Evaluators, UNDP, 2011.

United Nations in Jamaica, Annual Country Report 2017

United Nations Joint Team on HIV Jamaica workplan 2020-2021

United Nations Joint Team on HIV Jamaica, Country Report 2018-2019 Biennium



United Nations Joint Team on HIV, Terms of Reference, 2020

United Nations Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework in the Caribbean 2016

United Nations Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework in the Caribbean 2017 – 2021

USAID, 2011, Climate change vulnerability assessment and adaptation prioritization, USAID 2011

USAID, 2017, Climate Risk Profile - Jamaica, USAID 2017

USAID, 2019, Lessons learned from USAID’s climate change portfolio in Jamaica, USAID 2019

World Bank, 2019, Doing Business 2019 – Training for Reform: Economy Profile of Jamaica, a World Bank Group Flagship Report, 2019

Women’s Health Survey 2016 Jamaica, Watson Williams, Carol, Co-publication of the Statistical Institute of Jamaica, Inter-American Development Bank and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

ANNEX 5. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN (CPAP) OUTCOME INDICATORS

Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of October 2020)								
Outcome	Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress			
					2017	2018	2019	2020
Outcome 1								
Access to equitable social protection systems, quality services improved and sustainable economic opportunities improved	Output 1.1: Options enabled and facilitated for inclusive and sustainable social protection [SP output 1.2]	Extent to which policy and institutional reforms increase access to social protection schemes targeting the poor and other at-risk groups	Proposals tabled for Cabinet's approval	Access to social protection schemes increased	Proposals tabled for Cabinet's approval	Proposals tabled for Cabinet's approval	Proposals tabled for Cabinet's approval ³⁴	Proposals tabled for Cabinet's approval
		Number of parishes that mainstream migration into local sustainable development plan	0	5	0	0	3	3
		Extent to which migration framework is strengthened to facilitate coordination of migration services	Very partially	Largely	Very partially	Very partially	Partially ³⁵	Partially
	Output 1.2: National development plans and strategies address poverty and inequality for sustainability and risk resilience [SP output 7.3]	Number of diagnostics carried out in Jamaica to inform policy options on national response to globally agreed development agenda, including with analysis of sustainability and risk resilience, with post-2015 poverty eradication commitments and targets specified	4	18	9	12	16	17

³⁴ UNDP provided support to (1) Draft Deportation Policy, (2) Strategy for the Reintegration and Rehabilitation of of IRMS (3) M&E framework Water sector Policy (4) SOP for integration of migrants. There is no evidence that the deportation policy has increased access to social protection schemes.

³⁵ Migration framework was developed. But there are no available data to respond to the indicator.

Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of October 2020)

Outcome	Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress			
					2017	2018	2019	2020
	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 [SP output 7.2]	Extent to which updated and sex-disaggregated data are being used to monitor progress on national development goals aligned with post-2015 agenda	Partially	Largely	Partially	Partially	Partially ³⁶	Partially
	Output 1.4: Functions, financing and capacity of subnational-level institutions enabled to deliver improved basic services and respond to priorities voiced by the public [SP output 3.2]	Level of capacity of sub-national governments/ administrations for planning, budgeting and monitoring basic services delivery	Very Partially	Partially	Very partially	Very partially	Very partially	Very partially
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 [SP output 2.3 modified]	Extent to which operational institutions have the capacity to support fulfilment of nationally and internationally ratified human rights obligations	Not Adequately	Partially	Not adequately	Not adequately	Not adequately	Not adequately
		Extent to which relevant civil society groups have strengthened capacity to engage in critical development and crisis-related issues, disaggregated by women's, youth and excluded/vulnerable groups	Not Adequately	Partially	Not adequately	Not adequately ³⁷	Partially ³⁸	Partially

³⁶ The Planning Institute of Jamaica's (PIOJ) capacity to track development progress was improved through the development of two online based systems geared at increasing the efficiency of monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems in tracking the SDGs and national development targets. No data available yet how and to what extent data have been used.

³⁷ The technical capacities of six CSOs were enhanced through the provision of training in assessing and identifying social vulnerability to address issues such as poor parenting techniques, sexual abuse and GBV.

³⁸ For projects IRM, JUST-SO, HSTF, BLIC, trainings were completed in social vulnerability targeting CSOs, as well as in International Human Rights Mechanisms and Strategic LGBTI Advocacy, etc.

Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of October 2020)

Outcome	Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress			
					2017	2018	2019	2020
	Output 2.2: Measures in place and implemented across sectors to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) [SP output 4.	Extent to which policy on human trafficking has been developed	No policy exists	Policy developed	No	Yes ³⁹	Yes ⁴⁰	Yes
		Existence of effective mechanisms to collect, disseminate sex disaggregated data and gender statistics and apply gender analysis	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
		Existence of new and/or strengthened multisectoral services (including legal, justice and security services) to prevent and address sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV)	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
		Existence of a comprehensive legal and policy framework to prevent and address sexual and gender-based violence	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
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 [SP output 1.5 modified]	Number of public hospitals in which renewable energy services account for at least 50 per cent of the energy mix	0	50	0	0 ⁴¹	0 ⁴²	0 ⁴³

³⁹ The MCO supported the completion of the draft policy on trafficking in persons.

⁴⁰ UNDP supported the development of Anti-trafficking in Person Policy & human trafficking database.

⁴¹ The MCO supported the assessment of the sustainable energy education at post-secondary level with recommendations for an improved curriculum.

⁴² Six Investment Grade Energy Audit (IGEA) for Six Public Health Facilities were completed.

⁴³ LED lighting interventions were completed at the National Chest, Bellevue and Sir John Golding Hospital in June 2020. This has resulted in an overall energy reduction of 40,000 kWh and cost savings of J\$1,572,287.01 with an average payback of 2 years and 3 months. A total of 20.08 tonnes of CO2 emissions have been reduced to date.

Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of October 2020)

Outcome	Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress			
					2017	2018	2019	2020
	Output 3.2: Scaled-up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors facilitated	Extent to which comprehensive measures – plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets - implemented to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient development objectives have been improved	Very partially	Partially	Very partially	Very partially ⁴⁴	Partially ⁴⁵	Partially
	Output 3.3: Gender-responsive disaster and climate risk management is integrated into the development planning and budgeted frameworks of key sectors [SP output 5.3]	Extent to which mechanisms exist at national and sub-national levels to prepare for and recover from disaster events with adequate financial and human resources, capacities and operating procedures	Partially	Largely	Partially ⁴⁶	Partially ⁴⁷	Partially ⁴⁸	Partially
		Number of national/subnational development and key sectoral plans being implemented that explicitly address disaster and/or climate risk management, disaggregated by those that are gender responsive	14	20	17	19	21	21
		Number of South-South and triangular cooperation partnerships that deliver measurable and sustainable development benefits for participants	0	6	0	4	4	5

⁴⁴ The MCO supported installation of water harvesting and irrigation infrastructure at 70 locations island wide. Two concrete water harvesting and storage facilities were also rehabilitated in addition to the partial completion of 2 climate smart school gardens.

⁴⁵ UNDP provided support to the establishment of Greenhouse Gas Database Management System and a harmonized system to track HCFCs. The MCO also supported the development of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and the water sector adaptation plans.

⁴⁶ The MCO supported recovery efforts in TCI.

⁴⁷ A total of 187 micro, small and medium sized business owners/operators were trained in Disaster Risk Reduction and Business Contingency Planning. The business owners were from across 5 parishes in Jamaica and it is anticipated that they are now better able to prepare for natural disasters.

⁴⁸ The MCO supported recovery efforts in The Bahamas.

Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of October 2020)

Outcome	Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress			
					2017	2018	2019	2020
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 [SP output 2.5]	Extent to which legal, policy and institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems	Very Partially	Partially	Very Partially	Very partially ⁴⁹	Partially ⁵⁰	Partially
	Output 4.2: Solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste [SP output 1.3]	No. of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level	0	2	0	2	4	6

Source: UNDP Corporate Planning System, MCO document (status of indicators); Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs), and the UNDP intranet CPD outputs indicators.

⁴⁹ UNDP supported the provision of grant funding to the Minerals' private sector industry players through outputs which saw the completion of training programmes, provision of new equipment and hand tools to increase production and to supply new orders for sustainable livelihoods for entrepreneurs as well as implementing environmental projects.

⁵⁰ During the reporting period the Minerals Policy was submitted to Cabinet for approval.

Annex 6. PROJECT LIST

		Budget	Expenditure	Donors	Start Date	End Date
Outcome 1: Access to equitable social protection systems, quality services improved, and sustainable economic opportunities improved						
1	Advancing the SDGs through Vision 2030 Jamaica	\$ 217,499.70	\$ 209,138.62	UNDP/Gov Jam	05/02/2019	30/06/2020
2	Returned Migrants in Jamaica	\$ 378,238.69	\$ 290,819.74	UNDP/UNOPS	01/08/2016	31/03/2020
3	Localizing the SDGs: Global Goals, Local Action	\$ 247,300.00	\$ 214,118.20	UNDP	01/01/2017	31/12/2017
4	Rejuvenating Communities: A Social Cohesive Approach	\$ 265,503.54	\$ 169,440.57	UNDP/Jam Rise life	01/09/2015	30/06/2020
5	Support to Effective National Implementation	\$ 179,095.00	\$ 157,186.78	UNDP	01/01/2013	31/12/2015
6	Strengthening Human Resilience	\$ 848,977.53	\$ 570,904.41	UNDP/UN TF	31/10/2017	30/09/2020
Outcome 2: CAPACITIES OF PUBLIC-POLICY AND RULE-OF-LAW INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS STRENGTHENED						
7	JUST Social Order Component	\$ 2,120,022.28	\$ 1,498,940.89	Canadian Int Dev	18/06/2018	31/08/2020
8	Spotlight Initiative- Jamaica	\$ 511,538.54	\$ 119,273.77	UNDP/MPTF		
9	Justice Undertakings for Social Transformation (JUST)	\$ 2,202,179.31	\$ 1,726,877.99	Canadian Int Dev	01/07/2012	30/06/2020
10	Enhancing Gender Equality and Mainstreaming	\$ 112,960.00	\$ 111,100.09	UNDP	01/04/2020	31/03/2021
11	GLOBAL FUND-CVC/COIN REGIONAL PROJECT	\$ 4,813,643.45	\$ 4,565,275.80	Global Fund AIDS	01/10/2016	31/12/2019
12	Being LGBTI in the Caribbean*	\$ 1,203,958.66	\$ -	USAID	01/10/2017	31/03/2021
Outcome 3: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION, DISASTER RISK REDUCTION AND UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO CLEAN AND SUSTAINABLE ENERGY IN PLACE						
13	EnGender – Jamaica**	\$ 179,749.69	\$ 144,727.89	Dept of foreign Afrs	01/03/2019	28/02/2023
14	Deployment of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency	\$ 1,257,110.41	\$ 393,560.57	GEF	01/09/2016	31/12/2020
15	TNC and BUR to the UNFCCC	\$ 537,867.27	\$ 404,085.10	GEF	01/01/2014	31/08/2019
16	Initiation Plan for E-Mobility Project	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 42,178.39	GEF	21/06/2019	31/12/2020
17	HCFC Phase out Management Plan -1st Stage Implementation	\$ 172,961.23	\$ 85,306.45	Montreal Protocol	24/05/2012	31/12/2018
18	Initiation Plan for Ratification of Kigali Amendment	\$ 190,603.82	\$ 150,330.17	UNDP	21/03/2018	30/06/2020
19	Resilient Recovery Programme - Bahamas	\$ 1,358,235.00	\$ 370,706.83	UNDP funding wind	05/11/2019	31/12/2020

20	Early Recovery Team Workplan*	\$ 3,459,400.45	\$ 43,711.47	Swiss agency for de	01/01/2008	31/12/2019
21	Support to Early Recovery in Turks and Caicos Islands	\$ 41,800.00	\$ 24,026.70	UNDP	28/09/2017	28/03/2018
22	Regional Recovery Plan for the Caribbean Post Hurricanes*	\$ 11,539,348.00	\$ 8,809.80	UNDP	28/09/2017	31/12/2019
23	Capacity Development for Energy Efficiency and Security	\$ -	\$ -		08/12/2011	31/12/2016
24	Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership	\$ 1,057,506.84	\$ 959,439.44	Gov of Japan	01/01/2015	31/12/2019
Outcome 4: INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS ADOPTED FOR THE CONSERVATION, RESTORATION AND USE OF ECOSYSTEMS AND NATURAL RESOURCES						
25	Stockholm POP National Implementation Plan	\$ 90,453.88	\$ 57,897.36	GEF	09/07/2019	30/07/2021
26	GEF 6 Initiation Plan	\$ 226,966.30	\$ 174,054.84	GEF	01/01/2018	31/05/2019
27	Strengthening sustainability of NPAS in Jamaica	\$ 294,156.28	\$ 242,141.92	GEF	05/02/2010	31/12/2019
28	Sixth National Reports on Biodiversity in LAC	\$ 105,500.00	\$ 91,167.36	GEF	25/11/2017	30/06/2020
29	LVMM II_ACP-EU Development Minerals Programme II	\$ 319,858.12	\$ 127,064.88	UNDP	28/11/2019	15/11/2022
30	Extractive Industries for Sustainable Development	\$ 967,848.00	\$ 875,477.43	UNDP/Euro Com	01/04/2016	31/12/2019
31	National Biodiversity Planning to Support Impl of CBD	\$ 4,756.03	\$ 4,359.54	GEF	25/09/2013	31/03/2017

*Regional projects.

**Multi country project.