TERMS OF REFERENCE TO CONDUCT THE EVALUATION OF THE UNDP COUNTRY
PROGRAMME FOR SURINAME 2012-2017

Title	Evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme for Suriname (2017-2021)
Purpose	These terms of reference are designed to guide the evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme for Suriname (2017-2021)
Location	Home-based or Paramaribo – Suriname
Application categories	A) An individual **international consultant** (Team leader) to undertake the evaluation of the CPD. B) An individual **national consultant** (Team member) to partner with the international consultant to undertake the CDP evaluation.
Start date	November 2020
Duration	36 Working days for the international consultant and 25 working days for the national consultant (Starting on November 25th, 2020 and Completion not later than January 30th, 2021) • 10 days for desk review and submission of the draft inception report • 25 days data collection through observations, consultations, interviews and focus group sessions; home-based and in-country work including travel to regions and locations outside Paramaribo when feasible and taking into account COVID19 measures in place in the countries • 16 days report writing, results validation and documenting lessons learned

A. INTRODUCTION

UNDP's corporate policy is to evaluate its development cooperation with the host government regularly to assess whether and how UNDP-funded interventions contribute to the achievement of agreed outputs, outcomes, i.e. changes in the development situation, and ultimately impact on people's lives. Evaluating the country programme, therefore, involves ascertaining whether and how UNDP has assisted in improving human development conditions for individuals, institutions, and systems. The evaluation also helps to clarify underlying factors affecting development, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned, and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming.

The 2017-2021 Country Programme Document for Suriname (CPD 2017-2021) describes UNDP as a strategic partner, responding to critical national challenges expressed in the National Development Plan (NDP), consistent with the United Nations Multi-country Sustainable Development Framework (UNMSDF) and the UNDP Strategic Plan, 2014-2017. The MSDF was formulated jointly in 2015 by the United Nations system and the Governments of the Caribbean subregion.

Currently, as of November 2020, the UN System is embarking on a Common Country Assessment (CCA) process to determine the development conditions of the country in view of the 2021-2025 UNMSDF preparation in collaboration with the Government of Suriname. This is also an opportune moment for UNDP to commission an independent evaluation of its CPD 2017-2021 and seize the opportunity for a holistic evaluation and assessment of UNDP's support and contributions to Suriname's development in light of the Decade of Action and Suriname's commitment to the SDGs.

From the national perspective, 2020 is an important year to steer strategic thinking around the future development priorities of the country as the country has just installed a new government for five years following a successful democratic election process in May 2020. A new mid-term (5 years) development plan, the national development plan 2021-2026, will soon be prepared by the new government.

The CPD evaluation, in tandem with the CCA process, will identify lessons learned and inform the design of UNDP's continued support to Suriname as a high middle income and a small island developing state (SIDS) country. A particular focus will be on the extent to which the UNDP's support addressed issues of sustainable human development, inclusive growth and equality; democratic governance, and civic engagement; environmental management and mitigation of the effects of Climate Change, and how its support can be strengthened or improved. This evaluation will present also forward-looking recommendations and emerging opportunities to shape the design of the next CPD.

These Terms of Reference are designed to guide the evaluation of the 2017-2021 UNDP CPD for Suriname.

B. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Suriname is classified as a middle-income country, with a gross national income-per-capita of US\$ 5,540[1] (2019) (was US\$9,950 (2014)). It has a Human Development Index value of 0.724(2018); ranking 98 out of 189[2] countries. Between 2005 and 2018, Suriname's HDI value increased from 0.676 to 0.724, an increase of 7.0 %. The gross domestic product (GDP) has doubled since 2006, growing from \$2.6 billion to \$5.2 billion in 2014, averaging a significant 4 per cent yearly increase. Growth has been fueled by high commodity prices for gold, lumber, oil, and bauxite, as well as higher remittances. However recent downturns in commodity prices have created fiscal and monetary pressures.

The dependence of Suriname on commodities (gold, crude oil, and aluminium, the latter until 2016) can be seen by the increasing proportions of these commodities in exports and revenue as a percent of GDP and

---

[1] https://www.statista.com/statistics/1070048/gross-national-income-per-capita-suriname/
[2] Suriname - Human Development Reports – UNDP hdr.undp.org › themes › hdr_theme › country-notes › SUR

the collinearity between commodities prices and economic growth. Suriname dependence on commodities has increased over time. In 2016 they represented 79% of total exports and 8% of government revenue. By 2018 their importance had increased to 86% of exports and 36% of revenue, mainly reflecting two new gold mine production coming online. The country's average growth rate for the period 2001-2014 had been 4.4 %, the second-highest in the Caribbean. However, Suriname recorded the largest economic decline in real GDP (-5.1 %) in the Caribbean in 2016. The economic growth returned, although at a reduced rate, averaging 1.9 % between 2017 and 2019, mostly led by gold production which increased by over 40 % in 2017, due to two new gold mines starting production and eventually increasing commodity prices

Today it is gold that matters. However, oil dependence is expected to increase with a recent offshore oil discovery. In January 2020 the Apache Corporation and Total announced a significant oil discovery at the offshore Maka Central-1 well, estimated at 300 million barrels of oil and 1.4 trillion cubic feet of gas[3]. It will take approximately eighteen months for the companies to decide whether the oil will be commercially extracted, and then it will take approximately three years before the oil goes into production. The State-owned oil company has a 20 % share and will have to put up about US$ 800 million to US$ 1 billion if it wants to participate in the production[4]. This find significantly increases the known reserves of Suriname.

The CPD for Suriname (2017-2021) recognized that despite the discovery of the oil the country still faced major development challenges typical of low-income economies: widespread poverty and widening inequality along with significant regional disparities and gender inequity; low educational achievement and limited health coverage; and high aid dependence and weak institutions

In regard to environmental and natural resource management, Suriname as part of its national REDD+ strategy has identified a number of policies and measures (PAMs) to improve current policy, institutional and monitoring frameworks for Sustainable Forest Management, including more inclusive Forest Governance. Key institutional actors in the mining sector are functioning with limited resources, including the recently created Environmental Planning and Information Office (EPIO) of the National Institute for Environment and Development (NIMOS) . The EPIO is responsible for environmental planning in the sense of spatial mapping and zoning, the maintenance of databases and information, and for the development of the National Environmental Action Plan. However, since its creation through a GEF-supported project in 2016, the EPIO is still understaffed (1 professional), with limited operational means for attending to matters in the interior.

Other key institutions involved in the mining sector are undergoing a reform process including the Geological and Mining Services (GMD) of the Ministry of Natural Resources which is undergoing a process of upgrading and will be merged with the Bauxite Institute and the Presidential Commission to Regulate the Gold Mining Sector (OGS), to become a fully autonomous Mining Institute (MINAS). Despite this ongoing reform, all stakeholders suffer from **a lack of sufficient qualified human resources**, including the lack of equipment and hands-on training skills, which limits the government's capacity to assess, monitor and address the negative effects of gold mining practices, and to monitor the state of licensed and illegal mining. According to the Intergovernmental Gold Forum (IGF) Mining Policy Framework Assessment, which was completed in 2017, the lack of resources and qualified personnel to administer the tax system, handle transfer and pricing issues and conduct audits, is exacerbated by the inability of the government to retain senior staff with relevant institutional knowledge.

---

[3] Estimates from Wood Mackenzie consulting group: https://oilnow.gy/featured/suriname-discovery-contains-300-million-barrels-of-oil-over-1-trillion-cubic-feet-of-gas-woodmac/
[4] The State-owned oil company is in the process of raising about US$1 billion (26 % of GDP) to support its 2020-2027 investment program. The first bond issue of US$150 million was made in the first quarter of 2020.

In a small middle-income country like Suriname, UNDP expected to have a greater impact by programming in areas that establishes networks across the Sustainable Development Goals agenda. UNDP remained connected with the international and donor community and is considered to be a primary partner for effective programming in Suriname.

C. EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluation should generate relevant and useful information to support evidence-based decision making.

Purpose: This evaluation has been designed with dual purposes: 1) to allow national counterparts and UNDP meet their accountability objectives, and 2) to capture good practices and lessons learned.

Scope: This evaluation covers the period 2017-2020 of the CPD implementation. It should be conducted between November 2020 and January 2021, to provide strategic direction and inputs to the preparation of the next UNDP CPD and the next UNMSDF, both scheduled to prepared in the 1st quarter of 2021.

The CPD for Suriname (2017-2021) focused on three broad areas of work: (a) democratic governance; (b) social development; and (c) environment and natural resource management, with gender equality integrated as a cross-cutting element. These are mainly aligned with outcomes 2 (open and participatory governance) and 1 (inclusive, sustainable development) of the UNDP Strategic Plan and correspond directly to Sustainable Development Goals 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 16.

Strategic Positioning, Concept, and Design

The Evaluation will assess the relevance of the CPD and UNDP's overall intervention, including an assessment of the appropriateness of the its design, including objectives, planned outputs, activities, and inputs The evaluation will also look at factors (both positive and negative) that have affected the implementation of the programme.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Management

A further focus of the evaluation will be on the extent to which adequate monitoring was undertaken throughout the period and the extent to which evaluation systems were adequate to capture significant developments and inform responsive management. The evaluation will assess how lessons learned have been captured and operationalized throughout the period under investigation.

D. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

Specifically, the evaluation shall examine the following criteria as catalogued in the table below.

Relevance	- To what extent has the CPD been aligned with the national development needs and priorities? - How well has the design of the CPD addressed the needs of the most vulnerable groups in Suriname? - To what extent has UNDP's selected method of implementationbeen appropriate to the development context? - To what extent have UN reforms influenced the relevance of UNDP support to the Government of Suriname?
Effectiveness	- To what extent has the UNDP programme accomplished its outputs? - To what extent is the programme on track to achieve its intended outcomes? - What are the main contributions to development for which UNDP is recognized in the Country?

	• What are the unexpected outcomes or consequences it yielded? What are their implications? • To what extent has UNDP been effective in supporting local initiatives for SDG fulfillment? Considered in aggregate, are these local initiatives producing nationally significant results? • Has UNDP been effective in advocating best practices and desired goals? • What evidence is there that UNDP support has contributed towards an improvement in a national government capacity, including institutional strengthening? • What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP performance? • Has UNDP been influential in national debates on democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management? Has it contributed to national priorities? • Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP country office, is UNDP well suited in providing technical assistance in **democratic governancein Suriname**? • Is UNDP well suited in providing technical assistance in social development in Suriname? • Is UNDP well suited in providing technical assistance in natural resource management, in Suriname? • Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving **democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management** in Suriname? • How effective has UNDP been in partnering with development partners in **democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management in Suriname**? • How effective has UNDP been in partnering with civil society, in democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management in Suriname? • How effective has UNDP been in partnering with the private sector in democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management in Suriname? • Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming in these areas?
Efficiency	• To what extent have the programme or project outputs been efficient and cost-effective? • Has there been an economical use of resources? What could be done to ensure more efficient use of resources in the country context? What are the main administrative constraints/ strengths? • Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively? • Has UNDP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in Suriname?
Sustainability	• What is the likelihood that **democratic governance,** initiatives which UNDP has supported are sustainable? • What is the likelihood that social development initiatives which UNDP has supported are sustainable? • What is the likelihood that environment and natural resource management initiatives which UNDP has supported are sustainable? • What mechanisms have been set in place by UNDP to support the government of Suriname to sustain improvements and gains in these areas?

	How should the portfolio of activities be enhanced to support central authorities, local communities, and civil society in improving service delivery over the long term?
	•
Coherence and partnerships	• To what extent are UNDP's engagements a reflection of key strategic considerations, in the development context of Suriname in relation to its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners? • What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships with national institutions, CSOs, UN Agencies, private sector, and other development partners in Suriname, to promote long term sustainability and durability of results? • To what extent has UNDP planned its work to promote coherence and complementarity with other United Nations partners and stakeholders? To what extent did UNDP develop partnerships that advanced the identified development results?

The evaluation should include an assessment of the extent to which the CPD design, implementation, and monitoring have considered the following cross cutting issue: **Gender Equality** • To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring, and reporting? • Is gender marker data assigned to projects representative of reality (focus should be placed on gender marker 2 and 3 projects)? • To what extent has UNDP supported **democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management** initiatives promoted positive changes in gender equality? • Have there been any unintended effects? **Human Rights** • To what extent have indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP's work? • What barriers can be identified as to the inclusion of vulnerable groups in UNDP's work and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?   Based on the above analysis, the evaluators will provide overarching conclusions on the achievement of the 2017-2021 CPD, as well as identify key development priorities that shall inform the focus of the new CPD. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer wider lessons for UNDP support in Suriname.

E. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACHES

Overall guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators* (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-2.shtml).

The evaluation is being conducted in accordance with the UNDP's Strategic Plan, and UNDP's Evaluation Policy which sets out a number of guiding principles, norms and criteria for evaluation in the organization.

Amongst the norms that the Policy seeks to uphold, the most important are that the evaluation exercise should be independent, impartial and of appropriate quality, but also that it should be intentional and designed with utility in mind.

The evaluation team will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials, donors, civil society organizations, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives, and community members.

The following steps in data collection are anticipated:

Desk Review

A desk review should be carried out of the key strategies and documents underpinning the work of UNDP in Suriname in support of **democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management**. This includes reviewing the UNMSDF and Country Implementation Plans (CIPs), and CPD annual work plans, monitoring and evaluation documents, etc, to be provided by the UNDP country office.

The evaluators are expected to review pertinent strategies, national plans, and reports, developed by the Government of Suriname, that are relevant to UNDP's support.

Field Data Collection

Following the desk review, the evaluators will build on the documented evidence through an agreed set of field and interview methodologies, including:
- Interviews with key partners and stakeholders
- Field visits to project sites and partner institutions
- Survey questionnaires where appropriate
- Participatory observation, focus groups, and appraisal sessions

The evaluation is expected to take a "theory of change'' (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP has supported, and observed progress in **democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management** initiatives at national and local levels in Suriname. The evaluation team will develop a logic model of how UNDP interventions in these areas are expected to lead to improved national development.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys, and site visits.

In place of the travel restrictions due to COVID19 and accessibility due to the language gap, these interventions could be conducted by the national consultant taking into account COVID19 measures and protocols enforced in the country.

F. DELIVERABLES

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

- Inception report
- Draft CDP Evaluation Report
- Presentation at the validation workshop with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
- Final CPD Evaluation report and a separate Lesson learned report extracted from the full report.

Reports are expected to be presented in English language while the presentation at the validation workshop should be facilitated in Dutch to address the language gaps of the stakeholders.

Ten working days following the contract signing, the evaluation team leader will produce an **inception report** containing the proposed theory of change and outcomes of the CPD evaluation guided by the analysis from the desk review. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources and data collection tools, as well as methods to be used for analysis. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed taking into consideration the impediments caused by COVID19. The inception report will be discussed and agreed upon with the UNDP country office before the evaluators proceed with interviews and or site visits. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale so that performance rating will be carried out for the five evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, as well as for the integration of cross-cutting issues such as gender equality.

The **draft evaluation report** will be shared with stakeholders and presented in a validation workshop, that the UNDP country office will organise. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluators will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the **final report**.

The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

     I.   Title
     II.   Table of Contents
     III.   List of Acronyms and Abbreviations
     IV.   Executive Summary
     V.   Introduction
     VI.   Description of the programme
     VII.   Evaluation Scope and Objectives
     VIII.   Evaluation Approach and Data Collection Methods and Analysis
     IX.   Evaluation Findings
     X.   Conclusions
     XI.   Recommendations
     XII.   Lessons Learned
     XIII.   Annexes

G. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The CPD evaluation will be undertaken by a team of two evaluators. One evaluator will be the Team Leader, and the second will be a nationally-based consultant. Both international and national consultants can be considered for the position of Team Leader.

Required Qualifications of the Team Leader
- Minimum Master's degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning, or any other social sciences related to economic management and pro-poor development;
- Extensive knowledge and experience in evaluation, and evidence of similar evaluations conducted. Previous experience on UNDP output/outcome/impact/CPD/UNMSDF evaluations is welcome.
- Strong working knowledge of UNDP and its mandate, the civil society and working with government authorities;
- Experience in applying SMART (Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Relevant; Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Extensive professional experience in the area of development, including gender equality and social policies;

- Strong reporting and communication skills; excellent communication skills with various partners including donors;
- Knowledge on mainstreaming Gender in projects and programmes; and,
- Fluent in English (speak and write)

The **Team Leader** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report. The team leader will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology and approach;
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between the mission members;
- Conduct the CPD evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines;
- Draft and present the Inception Report, the Draft and Final evaluation report;
- Finalize the evaluation report and submit it to UNDP

Required qualification of the Evaluator (National Consultant)
- Be a Surinamese citizen with extensive experience working in the development field of Suriname during the last 10 years
- Minimum Master's degree in social sciences or related field
- Experience in at least 3 similar evaluation process and techniques
- Have strong communication skills
- Have good experience working with UN agencies will be an added advantage
- Have excellent reading and writing skills in English and Dutch
- Have a strong understanding of the development context in Suriname and preferably understanding the democratic governance; social development; and environment and natural resource management within the Surinamese context.

The evaluator will, *inter alia*, perform the following tasks:
- Review documents;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Conduct the evaluation in accordance with the proposed objectives and scope of the evaluation;
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report as agreed with the Evaluation Team Leader; and
- Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the draft and final evaluation report.

H. EVALUATION ETHICS

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. In particular, evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programming relating to the CPD under evaluation. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant are included in Annex 4.

I. IMPLEMENATION ARRANGEMENTS

The UNDP Suriname country office will select the evaluation team and will be responsible for the management of the evaluators. UNDP will designate a focal point for the evaluation and any additional staff to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Country Office will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The Deputy Resident Representative will arrange introductory meetings within UNDP and Unit Heads to establish initial contacts with government partners and project staff. The consultants will

take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The UNDP country office will develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

The Deputy Resident Representative will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detailed comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis, and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detailed rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remains unaddressed.

While the Country Office will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the evaluators to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the financial proposal and agreed with the Country Office, taking into account the COVID19 related restrictions and measures.

J. TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Activity	Responsible party	Timeframe /Deadline (# Workdays)
Desk review, evaluation design and workplan (Inception report)	Evaluation team	5 days
Field visits, interviews with partners, and key stakeholders (virtual due to COVID-19)	Evaluation team	20 days
Drafting of the evaluation and lesson learned reports	Evaluation team	5 days
Debriefing with UNDP	Evaluation team	1/2day
Debriefing with partners	Partners and the Evaluation team	1/2day
Finalization of the evaluation reports (incorporating comments received on first drafts)	Evaluation team	5 days
Total No. of Working Days		**36**

I. FEE

The consultants will be recruited and paid in accordance with UN conditions and procedures. The below structure may apply
- 20% upon submission and acceptance of an inception report, indicating preparations made and how the assignment is going to be executed.
- 40% on submission and acceptance of the Draft Final Report.
- 40% on submission and acceptance of the Final Report.

J. CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS

The proposals will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed approach, including the following;
- Technical approach as illustrated in the description of the proposed methodology and timeline. (40%)

- Evidence of experience of the consultant in conducting evaluations as detailed in the CV with associated contact details of references.(30%)
- Financial proposal (30%)

Annex 1: Summarized CPD Results Framework

Democratic governance
NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL: In its National Development Plan, the Government is committed to implementing clear and transparent policies for restructuring the public sector, implementing good governance, and mainstreaming gender policies. Sustainable Development Goals 5, 16
UNITED NATIONS MULTI-COUNTRY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (UNMSDF) Outcome: Capacities of public policy and rule of law institutions and civil society organizations strengthene and Just Caribbean) **Related UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome: 2.** Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law, and accountal met by stronger systems of democratic governance**.**

Social development
NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL: National Development Plan 2012-2016 Chapter V Welfare and Chapter V.4.2 Social Security and Welfare Sustainable Development Goals 1, 8, 10
UNMSDF Outcome: Access to equitable social protection systems, quality services, and sustainable economic opportunities improved, (An Inclusive, Equitable, and Prosperous Caribbean). **Related Strategic Plan Outcome: 7.** Development debates and actions at all levels prioritize poverty, in consistent with our engagement principles**.**

Environment and natural resource management
NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL: Suriname, through a climate compatible development approach, will have put in place advanced capacities, policies, institutional frameworks, engaged and active citizens for adaptive and agile production systems that can respond to increasing socio-economic, environmental and climatic challenges (INDC 2015). Sustainable Development Goals 11, 13, 14, 15
UNMSDF Outcome: Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration, and use of ecosystems and natural resources. (A Sustainable and Resilient Caribbean) **Related Strategic Plan Outcome:** 1. Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded

Annex 2:Reference Materials

The evaluators should study the following documents:

1.	UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
2.	UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
3.	UNDP Results-Based Management: Technical Note
4.	Country Programme Document (CPD) (2017-2021)
5.	UNMSDF
6.	Project Documents and relevant reports
7.	Other documents and materials related to the outcome to be evaluated (from the government, donors, etc.)

Annex 3: Inception Report Template

Background and context—illustrate understanding of the project, outcome, or programme to be evaluated.

Evaluation objective, purpose and scope—Theory of Change (TOC) and aclear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.

Evaluation criteria and questions—The criteria and questions which the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field visits.

Evaluability analysis—illustrate the evaluability based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) as well as the implication for the proposed methodology.

Cross-cutting issues—provide a detail of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered, and analyzed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.

Evaluation approach and methodology—A description of data collection methods and data sources to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data collection tools, instruments and protocols and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation; and the sampling plan.

Evaluation matrix— The evaluation matrix is a tool to map, reference, planning and conducting the evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated (see Table A).

Table A. Sample evaluation matrix						
Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-questions	Data Sources	Data collection methods/tools	Indicators / Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

Revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).

Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan, which can include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites.

Outline of the draft/final report—as detailed in the guidelines and ensuring quality and usability. The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outline din these guidelines and also meet the quality assessment requirements.

Annex 4: Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations System

1. The conduct of evaluators in the UN system should be beyond reproach at all times. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the UN or the UN itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.

2. The UNEG Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the UN system. The principles behind the Code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service by which all UN staff are bound. UN staff are also subject to any UNEG member-specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement of services.

3. The provisions of the UNEG Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.

4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for the United Nations system are required to commit themselves in writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation, specifically to the following obligations:

Independence
5. Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

Impartiality
6. Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project, or organizational unit being evaluated.

Conflict of Interest
7. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form.

Honesty and Integrity
8. Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behavior, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

Competence
9. Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

Accountability
10. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.

Obligations to participants
11. Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively

powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

Confidentiality

12. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

Avoidance of Harm

13. Evaluators shall act to minimize risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

14. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.

Transparency

15. Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

Omissions and wrongdoing

16. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

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

Name of Consultant: _____

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

Place and date:

Signature: _____