ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)”, previously known as “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 effort 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 responsibility of the IEO is two-fold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (b) 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.

This is IEO’s second country programme evaluation conducted in Brazil.\(^2\) The evaluation will focus on UNDP’s work during the ongoing programme cycle 2017-2021 and will evaluate the work up to mid-2020. The ICPE will be conducted in collaboration with the national authorities, with the UNDP Brazil Country Office (CO), and with the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC). The evaluation is expected to provide a set of forward-looking recommendations as input to the new country programme document.

NATIONAL CONTEXT

Brazil is an upper middle-income country with population of 211 million in 2018, of which 87 percent reside in urban areas.\(^3\) The country is considered within the high human development category, measured by the HDI value of 0.761 in 2018, positioning it at 79 out of 189 countries and territories and above the average of 0.750 for countries in the high human development group and above the average of 0.759 for countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.\(^4\) Brazil GNI per capita for 2018 was $9,140, a 5.42 percent increase from 2017, the first year it recorded an increase since 2015 (see paragraph below).\(^5\)

---

2 The first evaluation was the Assessment of Development Results (ADR) from 2011 and it covered the programme periods 2002 to 2010.
5 Macrotrends, based on World Bank data, Brazil GNI per capita 1966-2020, available at: https://www.macrotrends.net/countries/BRA/brazil/gni-per-capita
Economic development, poverty and inequality

Despite this classification, the country faces important development challenges, including high inequality. The HDI falls to 0.574 when inequality is considered, a loss of 24.5 percent, much higher than the overall loss of the group of High HDI, which is 17.9 percent.  

The Gini Index decreased between 2012 and 2015 (from 0.540 to 0.524), but the trend reversed from 2016 onwards, when the index increased to 0.537, hitting 0.545 in 2018. From 2017 to 2018, earnings increased by 8.4 percent for the richest 1 percent of the population and dropped for the group which represents the poorest, reaching a level in 2018 in which the monthly average earnings of the richest 1 percent population was nearly 34 times higher than those in the poorest group, which represents approximately 50 percent of the population. Additionally, significant disparities are found between demographic groups and regions in Brazil. The poverty rates in rural areas are double those of urban areas and much higher in the North and Northeast than in the rest of the country. While poverty rates are low for those aged 65 or above, thanks to the wide coverage of pensions and social assistance, a third of Brazilian children under 15 live in poverty. Disparity between regions can be found as well in terms of health, for instance, mortality in the neonatal period, between 2015 and 2017, exceeded eleven deaths per 1,000 live births in the North and Northeast, while it was below nine deaths per 1,000 live births in the Southeast and below eight deaths in the Southern region.

Brazil’s recent recession, in 2015 and 2016, saw the GDP dropping by 3.6 percent and 3.4 percent (respectively), and ended an eleven-year streak of poverty reduction. Between 2003 and 2014, the poverty rate, measured as the share of the population living on less than US$5.50 per day (in 2011 PPP terms), fell from 41.7 to 17.9 percent. The poverty impact of the recession was most pronounced in 2015, as 1.5 percent of the population fell into poverty. Poverty continued to increase in 2016 and in 2017, when poverty reached 21.0 percent of the population (43.6 million people). In 2018 poverty affected one fourth of the Brazilian population, or 52.5 million persons, touching mainly the black or afro-descent population, which represents 72.7 percent of the poor, or 38.1 million persons. Black or afro-descent women represent the largest number of people, 27.2 million persons, below poverty line. In 2018, black or afro-descent persons had a per capita monthly household earnings of US$934, almost half the average earnings of white persons (US$1,846). Extreme poverty, understood as per capita average earnings below US$145, or US$1.9 per day, has reached its highest level in seven years in 2018, affecting 13.5 million persons. Even if Brazil has now re-entered a phase of positive economic growth, modest gains in 2018 and 2019 suggests limited poverty reduction in the short-term.
Unemployment was seen as the main cause of increased poverty during the last recession. It doubled from 2014 to 2017 reaching 13.8 percent and since then it has mildly decreased to 12 percent in 2019. Young people are highly affected, with almost 11 million aged 15 to 29, which are neither employed nor studying/training. This group represents 23 percent of the country’s population in this age group. At the same time, understanding the non-monetary dimensions of poverty highlights the long-term challenges faced by households in Brazil. The two critical challenges are educational attainment by the adult population and access to basic infrastructure. In 2017, around 17 percent of the population lived in households in which no adult has completed high school, a consequence of low investment in human capital in earlier generations.

Gender

Brazil’s 2018 Gender Development Index (GDI) value of 0.995 indicates a better situation than the average in the Latin America and the Caribbean countries (0.978) and better that the High HDI group of countries (0.960). Women perform better than men, in each of the HDI dimensions, except in the one related to GNI per capita, with an important gap of over 41 percent in favour of men. Female participation in the labour market is 54.0 percent compared to 74.4 for men. Women represented 52 percent of voters in the last election, and 77 women currently hold seats at Parliament (15 percent of parliamentary seats). It is the highest number in the country’s history, but far from the average of 31.6 percent of women in parliaments in the Latin America and the Caribbean region.

Key women’s health indicators have improved in the last decade. For instance, 44 women died from pregnancy related causes, for every 100,000 live births, in 2015, 34 percent less than in 2005. Adolescent birth rate is 59 births per 1,000 women of ages 15-19 in 2017, 20 percent less than in 2005. Since 2015, femicide is recognized as a criminal offense by law, representing an important step in recognizing the specificities of violence against women. Femicides correspond to 29.6 percent of intentional homicides of women in 2018. There were 1,151 cases in 2017 and 1,206 in 2018, an increase of 4 percent in absolute numbers. The victims profile reveals that black women are the most vulnerable: they are 61 percent of the victims, while 38.5 percent are white, and 0.3 percent are indigenous women. The relationship between social vulnerability and violence can also be seen in schooling indicators: 70.7 percent of victims attended elementary school, while 7.3 percent have higher education.

17 According to the Continuous Pnad - Education Supplement, conducted by the IBGE in 2018
21 Inter-Parliamentary Union. Brazil. https://data.ipu.org/content/brazil?chamber_id=13349#
22 Electoral law (9.504/1997 amended by law 12.034/2009) guarantees that lists contain a minimum of 30% of candidates of each sex. See https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/gender-quotas/country-view/68/35 for details on the electoral quota system in Brazil
26 Law no. 13.104
27 According to data from the Brazilian Public Safety 2019 Yearbook http://www.forumseguranca.org.br/
28 According to data from the Brazilian Public Safety 2019 Yearbook http://www.forumseguranca.org.br/
Institutional capacity and justice system

Brazil has experienced important advances in access to Justice, such as the strengthening of Public Defenders Offices, the creation of a National Council of Justice and the implementation of policies targeted to promote alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.\(^{29}\) However some key challenges in terms of institutional effectiveness remain and include: 1) violence, whether fatal or not, physical, psychological and sexual and how to face it by the complex criminal justice system;\(^{30}\) 2) access to citizenship; Brazil still faces problems in ensuring access to citizenship, fundamental freedoms, justice and public information; 3) Tax evasion and corruption which weaken public institutions; and 4) how to ensure that SDGs and the 2030 Agenda is indeed implemented by the federal, state, municipal, and federal district governments and their institutions, as well as the judiciary, the prosecutor, and the public defense.\(^{31}\)

Since 2016, the Corruption Perceptions Index for Brazil shows a downward trend, scoring 35 percent in 2018, its lowest CPI score in seven years, and placing the country 105 out of 180 countries worldwide.\(^{32}\) Anti-corruption efforts helped bring corrupt individuals from across political parties and the private sector to justice.\(^{33}\) These highlighted an extreme degree of abuse and corruption in many of Brazil’s institutions, and it also revealed a growing cynicism and sense of hopelessness among citizens.\(^{34}\)

Environment, energy and natural resources

Brazil has some of the world’s most abundant renewable and non-renewable resources. For example, with its extensive river systems and plentiful rainfall, Brazil has one of the largest hydroelectric potentials in the world. Forests cover about three-fifths of Brazil’s land area, representing between one-sixth and one-seventh of the world’s forest coverage.\(^{35}\) Brazil is the most biologically diverse country in the world. It is classified at the top among the world’s 17 megadiverse countries, and second only to Indonesia in terms of species endemism. It contains two biodiversity hotspots (the Atlantic Forest and the Cerrado), six terrestrial biomes and three large marine ecosystems.\(^{36}\) It is also estimated that Brazil hosts between 15-20 percent of the world’s biological diversity, with the greatest number of endemic species on a global scale.\(^{37}\)

Aside from the conservation of forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, Brazil faces several environmental challenges. During the 1990-2014 period, 65 percent of all losses due to disasters were from floods, 11 percent from landslide and 9 percent from drought.\(^{38}\) In 2015, Brazil saw 337.7 people killed, missing or affected by disasters per 100,000 inhabitants. In 2016 and 2017 the situation improved with 134.8 and 232.7 per 100,000, respectively.\(^{39}\) The Northern region is particularly affected with 751 per 100,000 inhabitants people killed, missing and affected in 2017.\(^{40}\)

\(^{29}\) UNDP Country Program Document 2017-2021

\(^{30}\) The homicide rate per 100,000 inhabitants has increased from 30 in 2007 to 41 in 2017.\(^{30}\) In that same period, homicides of black victims increased by 33.1 percent while homicides of non-black victims increased by 3.3 percent. Out of every 100 victims murdered, 75 are black. According to data from the Brazilian Public Safety 2019 Yearbook \[^{\text{http://www.forumseguranca.org.br/}}\]

\(^{31}\) Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada – ipea 2019. ODS 16 Report. \[^{\text{http://www.ipea.gov.br/}}\]


\(^{33}\) Transparency International. CPI 2018 Regional Analysis: Americas. \[^{\text{https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018#results}}\]

\(^{34}\) Transparency International. CPI 2018 Regional Analysis: Americas. \[^{\text{https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018#results}}\]

\(^{35}\) Encyclopædia Britannica, Brazil. \[^{\text{https://www.britannica.com/place/Brazil}}\]

\(^{36}\) Convention on Biological Diversity, Brazil Country Profile. \[^{\text{https://www.cbd.int/countries/profile/?country=br}}\]

\(^{37}\) The Biodiversity Finance Initiative, 2019. \[^{\text{https://www.biodiversityfinance.net/brazil}}\]

\(^{38}\) Data from the OFDA/CRED - International Disaster Database. \[^{\text{https://www.preventionweb.net/countries/bra/data/}}\]


\(^{40}\) Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada – ipea 2019. ODS 13 Report. \[^{\text{http://www.ipea.gov.br/}}\]
In cities, challenges relate to solid waste management, urban stormwater drainage, sewage disposal, and fresh industrial sewage management. In terms of basic infrastructure, a third of the population did not have access to improved sanitation in 2017, a deprivation that has health and environmental implications.\(^\text{41}\)

In rural areas, Brazil has recently become aware of a lack of water quality monitoring, which is increasingly receiving pesticide residues, sometimes over-applied, as well as nutrients from fertilizers.\(^\text{42}\)

Electricity generation from renewable sources (hydro, wind, biomass, solar and others) reached 80.4 percent of the total supply in 2017, with predominant share of hydropower (65.2 percent). Other renewable sources, as wind and solar, increased their share from 28.6 percent in 2012 to 31.2 percent in 2017. The result is consistent with two actions in Brazil’s Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to the Paris Agreement, that is, to expand the use of renewable sources other than hydropower in the energy matrix for participation by 28 percent to 33 percent by 2030 and increase the share of sustainable bioenergy in the Brazilian energy matrix to approximately 18 percent by 2030.\(^\text{43}\) However, notwithstanding the high participation of hydroelectric plants in the generation of electricity, the energy tariff applied in Brazil is one of the highest in the world.\(^\text{44}\)

**International cooperation**

Brazilian foreign policy has been internationally recognized, in comparative terms, for its stability, continuity, and a high degree of predictability\(^\text{45}\). A founding member of the BRIC group, Brazil has been active on several fronts, including international cooperation, and is recognized as an increasingly important aid player.\(^\text{46}\) The Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) has been active since 1987. ABC’s activities include technical cooperation programs and projects through South-South cooperation. Brazil participated in 1 of every 5 South-South Cooperation exchanges that took place between Latin American countries during 2016.\(^\text{47}\) As of 2016, Brazilian South-South Cooperation (SSC) had provided technical cooperation to 98 countries, most of them in Africa and Latin America, particularly Portuguese speaking countries.\(^\text{48}\) The concept of "partnership for development", adopted by Brazil, consolidates the idea that development cooperation entails sharing efforts and benefits on both sides. Proposed initiatives are evaluated in the light of impact and outreach on recipient communities.\(^\text{49}\) Brazil is also a key player in the international environmental negotiations, the conservation of Brazilian forest cover, and in particular the Amazon rainforest and the rich variety of biodiversity and ecosystems of the country have long been at the core of the discussions on how to reach the Paris Climate Change Agreement and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (Convention on Biological Diversity).

---


\(^{46}\) See for example, Overseas Development Institute, 2010. *Brazil: an emerging aid player, briefing no 64.* At the same time, Brazil is still listed as an ODA recipient country, but income has been decreasing sharply from 1003 ml in 2015 to 265 in 2017. The main donors in 2017 were Germany and the EU institutions, for official ODA data see: [https://public.tableau.com/views/OECDDACADataglancebyrecipient_new/Recipients?embed=y&display_count=yes&showTabs=y&toolbar=no&showVizHome=no](https://public.tableau.com/views/OECDDACADataglancebyrecipient_new/Recipients?embed=y&display_count=yes&showTabs=y&toolbar=no&showVizHome=no)

\(^{47}\) Ibero-American Program for Strengthening South-South Cooperation (PIFCSS). [https://www.informesursur.org/](https://www.informesursur.org/)

\(^{48}\) UNDP Brazil, Country Program Document 2017-2021

\(^{49}\) Agencia Brasileira de Cooperação [http://www.abc.gov.br/CooperacaoTecnica/OBrasileirosCooperacao](http://www.abc.gov.br/CooperacaoTecnica/OBrasileirosCooperacao)
COVID-19 pandemic

Brazil has become a global epicenter of the coronavirus COVID-19 pandemic. As of 17 August 2020, there have been 3,317,096 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with 107,232 deaths.\(^5\) As a result, Brazil, Latin America’s largest nation, is the second country with the most confirmed cases of COVID-19 only behind the United States. With a high-income inequality and rising poverty, Brazil is suffering a health care crisis. Although Brazil has a strong health care system, capacity is uneven across the country. People living in poverty especially in the North and Northeast of Brazil are less likely to have health insurance and to use health services. Therefore, exposing Brazil’s population to the risks of COVID-19 and other health complications.

In addition, to health, the COVID-19 crisis is affecting Brazil’s economy and exposing the country to social challenges. The COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted Brazil’s supply and demand, slowed down Brazil’s domestic economic activity, and disrupted the country’s financial market volatility. Rising unemployment and economic uncertainty has aggravated the macroeconomic challenges the country was already facing. The World Bank has estimated that a deep recession will hit Brazil, with an estimated growth rate at −8 percent in 2020\(^5\).

UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN BRAZIL

The IEO conducted an Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in 2011, covering the period 2002-2010. UNDP then implemented a new country programme, planned for the 2012-2015, extended to 2016.

The work of UNDP in the country for the period 2017-2021 is guided by the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), which is aligned with the priorities identified by the Government in its Pluriannual Government Plan 2016-2019. The UNDAF, developed by the UN country team, focused on five pillars, of which the UNDP’s Country Programme Document 2017-2021 committed to support the following four priorities:

1. Inclusive and equitable society with extensive rights for all men and women, including enhancement of public services in the areas of health, social assistance and rural development, with emphasis on gender, race, ethnicity and generational equity;
2. Sustainable management of natural resources for present and future generation, including implementation of national environmental legislation, productive inclusion and access to markets of vulnerable groups, resilience strengthening and sustainable production and consumption patterns;
3. Prosperity and quality of life for everyone, including inclusive economic growth and business models, inclusive dialogue with extractive industries and public-private collaboration; and
4. Peaceful, fair and inclusive society, including rule of law and access to justice, violence prevention, citizen participation, human rights, accountability and SDGs.

The country programme is focused on supporting the country in the achievement of the SDGs around the four keys areas of people, planet, prosperity and peace (see table 1 for details) and intended to pay special attention to vulnerable areas and populations, especially the North and Northeast, the rural poor, women of afro-descendant, indigenous people and the LGBTI. It aims to mainstream issues on the reduction of inequalities and resilience to shocks across the portfolio. Special attention was expected to be paid to increase partnerships with UNDP Global Centers. The programme intended to mobilize funds and in-kind contributions from national

---

counterparts from all government levels, IFIs, private sector, foreign governments interested in partnering with the Government of Brazil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Programme Outcome</th>
<th>Country Programme Output</th>
<th>Planned resources, USD (per CPD)</th>
<th>Expenditures, USD (as of July 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: People</strong></td>
<td>1.1. Institutional capacities strengthened to formulate and implement sustainable policies and strategies to improve the population access to health and promote wellbeing</td>
<td>120 million</td>
<td>72,747,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Institutional capacities strengthened in order to promote access to rights and sustainable livelihoods, with special attention to vulnerable populations and traditional peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Institutional capacities strengthened to support the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of social policies, with participation and social control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. SSCT initiatives supported oriented by the Brazilian Foreign Policy priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2: Planet</strong></td>
<td>2.1. Policies strengthened for the adoption, implementation, and monitoring of mitigation and adaptation measures to climate change, mainstreaming and integrating national plans and international agreements</td>
<td>100 million</td>
<td>60,455,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Policies strengthened to guarantee effectiveness of ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation, promoting sustainable land use, recover degraded land and combat desertification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Partnerships with governmental institutions, private sector and civil society established to ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns, promoting energy efficiency, clean and renewable technologies, and environmentally sustainable practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4. Strategies and technical capacities strengthened for making cities, communities and territories inclusive, integrated, safe, accessible, resilient and sustainable, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5. Capacities strengthened for the elaboration and implementation of policies and actions in DRM its preventive and disaster preparedness including climate change adaptation, in a multisector and integrated approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 Resources received to date and indicative expenditure to date include data on regional and global projects in Brazil. Source: UNDP Brazil Country Programme Document 2017-2021 and UNDP data extracted from Atlas / PowerBi as of 17 July 2020. It does not reflect the re-allocation of outputs by outcome based on validation by the CO of the evaluation project list. These will be presented in the evaluation report.
Outcome 3: Prosperity
Inclusive and environmentally sustainable economic growth, with productive diversification, industrial strengthening, resilient infrastructures, increased productivity and innovation, transparency, social participation and enhancement of micro and small enterprises

3.1. Inclusive business and market ecosystem strengthened, through productive investments, information and implementation support.
3.2. Studies, information and technological innovation increased to maximize financial inclusion and promote inclusive economic growth.
3.3. Technical capacity strengthened to improve infrastructure and basic services to support Brazilian companies to reach underserved areas and foreign markets promoting an agile business environment and a more sustainable economic growth.
3.4. Multistakeholder partnerships intensified and expanded to support and promote inclusive and sustainable growth, through knowledge exchange and capacity building activities

10 million 17,658,026

Outcome 4: Peace
A peaceful, fair and inclusive society promoted through social participation, transparency and democratic governance, respecting the secularity of the State and ensuring human rights for all

4.1. Innovative approach to security policies and programmes promoted through capacity development, knowledge building, and dialogue, with a participatory and multidisciplinary methodologies.
4.2. Institutional and technical capacity developed to enhance transparency, accountability and innovative institutions at all levels, through social participation, effective management, information, and coordination mechanisms
4.3. Access to Justice actions promoted, strengthening the Justice System and promoting alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, fostering a culture of peaceful dispute resolution at all levels
4.4. Strengthening national and sub-national mechanisms and policies for the promotion of human rights, considering gender, race, ethnicity and generational inequalities and excluded groups, regardless of their nationality

20 million 17,253,625

Total 250 million 168,796,311

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION
ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme to contribute to the process of developing the new country programme. Thus, the ICPE will focus on the current programme cycle (2017-2021), covering the period of 2017 to early 2020, to provide forward-looking recommendations as input to UNDP Brazil’s formulation of its next country programme. It will also examine the degree of adoption and follow-up of the recommendations of the 2011 ADR evaluation.

The scope of the ICPE includes the entirety of UNDP’s development programmes in the country, including those projects running from the previous cycle into the current one. The interventions under review are funded by all sources, including those from UNDP’s regular resources, donors, and the Government. The efforts supported by UNDP’s regional and global programmes will also be included.

METHODOLOGY
The ICPE will address the following key evaluation questions. 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, the sustainability of results?

The ICPE is conducted at the outcome level, and its methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate. 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 CPD’s progression over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD’s evolution, UNDP’s capacity to adapt to the changing context and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at.

The effectiveness of UNDP’s country programme will be analysed under evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved outputs and the extent to which these outputs have contributed to the intended CPD outcomes. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes will also be identified.

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

Special attention will be given to integrate a gender-responsive evaluation approach to data collection methods. The evaluation will analyse the extent to which UNDP (country) support was designed to and did contribute to gender equality and will consider the gender marker and the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES). The GRES, developed by IEO, classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative.
DATA COLLECTION

Data collection methods. The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of corporate and project documentation and surveys. All information and data collected from multiple sources and through various means will be triangulated to ensure its validity before the evaluation reaches conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation will rely on the triangulation of the following data sources:

- A portfolio analysis and desk review of all programme documents, including UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs) and corporate monitoring of programme results; project documents and project progress reports; quality assurance reports and risk assessments; project, outcome and CPD evaluations; audit reports; financial data and background documents on the national context.
- Remote interviews with key informants, including government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, UNDP country office, RBLAC and beneficiaries of the programme. Efforts will be made to collect views from a diverse range of stakeholders on UNDP’s performance. A stakeholder analysis will be conducted with the support of the CO to identify relevant UNDP partners to be consulted during the main data collection phase of the evaluation.
- A pre-mission self-assessment questionnaire will be administered to the CO. It will focus on programme results and the CO internal management.
- A presentation of preliminary findings at the end of the data collection phase to validate initial findings with the CO staff.

In line with UNDP’s gender equality strategy, the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all the CO programmes and operations. Gender-related data will be collected by using corporately available sources (e.g., the Gender Marker) and programme/project-based sources (e.g. through desk reviews of documents and interviews), where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. A preliminary assessment was carried out to identify the evaluable data available as well as potential data collection constraints and opportunities. The Evaluation Resource Center (ERC) information indicates that, at the time of this TOR preparation, twelve project evaluations and one thematic evaluation had been completed for the period under review. Twelve evaluations are planned before the end of 2020. Seven evaluations were conducted between 2014 and 2016.

With respect to indicators, the CPD Outcomes, UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) and the corporate planning system (CPS) associated with it provide indicators, baselines and targets. However, there is no data on progress and sources of verification for some of the indicators. To the extent possible, the ICPE will use these indicators and data, as well as other alternative indicators which may have been used by CO, to interpret the UNDP programme goals and to measure or assess progress toward the intended outcomes. However, the CPD indicators try to assess aspects of performance that are well-outside of UNDP’s direct sphere of control, and for which the programme has limited influence. To mitigate these limitations, the evaluation will work with Theories of Change to try to estimate goals and map assumptions against the expected and achieved results.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The IEO Lead Evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will cover all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

UNDP Country Office in Brazil: The Country Office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders, make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP’s programmes,
projects and activities in the country, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The CO will provide support in kind (e.g. scheduling of interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries, etc). To ensure the anonymity of interviewees, the Country Office staff will not participate in the stakeholder interviews. The CO and IEO will jointly organize the final stakeholder debriefing, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a videoconference, where findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will be presented. Once a final draft report has been prepared, the CO will prepare a management response to the evaluation recommendations, in consultation with RBLAC. It will support the use and dissemination of the final ICPE report at the country level.

**UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean:** The UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in the final stakeholder debriefing. Once the evaluation has been completed, RBLAC is also responsible for monitoring the status and progress of the country office’s implementation of the evaluation recommendations, as defined in its management response.

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

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for developing the evaluation design and terms of reference; managing the conduct of the ICPE, preparing/ finalizing the final report; and organizing the stakeholder debrief, as appropriate, with the Country Office.
- **Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE):** IEO staff member with the general responsibility to support the LE, including in the preparation of terms of reference, data collection and analysis and the final report. Together with the LE, the ALE will help backstop the work of other team members.
- **Consultants:** external consultants will be recruited to collect data and help to assess relevant outcome areas, paying attention to gender equality and women’s empowerment. Under the guidance of the LE and ALE, they will conduct preliminary desk review, develop a data collection plan, prepare outcome analysis papers, conduct data collection, prepare sections of the report, and contribute to reviewing the final ICPE report.
- **Research Assistant:** a research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and will support the portfolio analysis.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process in the Charter of the Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP. There are five key phases to the evaluation process, as summarized below, which constitute the framework for conducting the evaluation.

**Phase 1: Preparatory work.** Following the initial consultation with the Country Office, the IEO prepares the ToR and the evaluation design, including an overall evaluation matrix with specific evaluation questions. Once the TOR is approved, additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals with relevant skills and expertise will be recruited if needed. The IEO, with the support of the Country Office, collects all relevant data and documentation for the evaluation.

**Phase 2: Desk review and analysis.** Evaluation team members will conduct desk review of reference material, identifying preliminary lines of inquiry which will be reviewed through a pre-mission questionnaire administered with the Country Office. Based on this, detailed questions and issues that require validation during the primary data collection phase will be identified.
Phase 3: Data collection. The evaluation team will conduct primary data/information collection through remote interviews with key stakeholders. At the end of the data collection phase, the evaluation team will hold a debriefing presentation of the key preliminary findings to the Country Office. After the debriefing, all additional data gaps and areas of further analysis should be identified for follow-ups.

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 and draft the ICPE report. The first draft of the report will be subject to internal (IEO) and external peer review. It will then 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 Brazil Country Office will prepare the management response to the ICPE, under the overall oversight of the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean. The report will then be shared at a final debriefing (via videoconference) where the results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders. Ways forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the recommendations and strengthening national accountability of UNDP. Considering the discussion at the stakeholder event, the final evaluation report will be produced.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report, including the management response, and evaluation brief will be widely distributed in hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board at the time of the approval of a new Country Programme Document. It will be distributed by the IEO within UNDP and to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Brazil Country Office will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website and the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the ERC.

TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS
The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible party</th>
<th>Proposed timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Preparatory work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR update</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Aug 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of external evaluation team members</td>
<td>LE/ALE</td>
<td>Aug-Sept 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Desk analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Aug-Sept 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3: Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and preliminary findings</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Synthesis</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Nov-Dec 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero draft report cleared by IEO (following external peer review)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Jan-Feb 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft ICPE for CO/RB review</td>
<td>CO/RB</td>
<td>Feb-Mar 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft shared with the government</td>
<td>CO/GOV</td>
<td>Feb-Mar 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft management response</td>
<td>CO/RB</td>
<td>Feb-Mar 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final debriefing with national stakeholders</td>
<td>CO/IEO</td>
<td>Apr 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 5: Production and Follow-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and formatting</td>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>Apr-May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report and evaluation brief</td>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of the final report</td>
<td>IEO/CO</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to the Executive Board</td>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>