UNDP End-of-Project Evaluation Terms of Reference (TORs) for the Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre (CARTAC)

**Development Context**

The Caribbean Region as a grouping of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) is experiencing accelerated structural change due to the global economic recession and its linked fiduciary impacts. The recession further compounded market liberalization impacts and the prolonged crisis has affected economic and social development levels at regional and national levels. CARICOM and OECS established regional programmes have provided macroeconomic policy, economic diversification and social development programmes support. While Caribbean states have maintained high to medium human development rankings, the projections for sustainable human development and regional competitiveness have been negative and the prolonged global economic recession has accentuated Small Island Developing States (SIDS) development challenges[[1]](#footnote-1) and vulnerabilities.

These challenges include issues of inequitable economic and social distribution of resources, increasingly frequent natural hazard vulnerabilities and high levels of public – external and domestic – debt which further limit governments’ fiscal space and capacities to fund social protection programmes.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Notwithstanding high levels of debt and vulnerability, Caribbean States are classified as middle income (MIC). The MIC classification has led to a significant reduction in access to concessionary financing. In fact recent UNDP research highlights that concessional debt as a proportion of total public debt has declined considerably in many countries over the last decade. This has been substituted with more costly, private external and/or domestic debt. The achievement of high and upper middle income status has not resulted in donors’ maintaining or increasing previously high levels of development assistance to the Caribbean Region.

**Project Background**

The Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre (CARTAC) was established as a UNDP cost-shared multi-donor project modality. The UNDP project, executed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), supported the establishment of a regional centre providing specialized macroeconomic, fiscal and monetary advice and capacity development support to 20 Caribbean countries (also includes Haiti and Dominican Republic). The CARICOM Council of Ministers of Finance and Planning (COFAP) decision to establish the Centre in September 1999 led to an operational CARTAC Office in Barbados by November 2001. The mission of CARTAC was stated as “to enhance the institutional and human capacities of the countries in the Caribbean region to achieve their macroeconomic, fiscal, and monetary policy objectives”.

CARTAC was initially established for a three year period (2001-2004) and has since been extended twice (2004-2007 and 2007-2010) and ended its 3rd Phase as a uniquely structured UNDP project. All other IMF Regional Technical Assistance Centres (Pacific, Africa, and Middle East) were established as Fund Projects.

At the time of CARTAC’s establishment, there was no IMF representation in the Caribbean. The closure of the IMF office in Barbados was the last closure before the establishment of CARTAC. CARTAC represented a Caribbean first as it met the Paris Declaration multi-donor project model with donors providing large, firm funding commitments for common, defined sectoral approaches and policy support.

CARTAC is a multi-donor funded programme with the Canadian International Development Agency providing the largest share of funding (CAD$ 20 million). Other contributors included the Department for International Development (DFID), the European Union, and the Caribbean Development Bank. UNDP contributed USD $50 000 per year and served as the Administrative Agent for the project. The Government of Barbados finances the host country costs, CARTAC’s office facilities costed at US70,000 a year and like other beneficiary countries provide annual contributions of USD $10 000.

The Governance structure of CARTAC is a Regional Steering Committee, which is currently chaired by the Governor of the Central Bank of Jamaica and includes representatives from five other participating countries, two representatives from the bilateral donors, and five from multilateral agencies. Work Programme priorities are decided on by the Steering Committee. CARTAC‘s unique governance structure supported the 2005-2008 UNDP Sub-regional Programme (SPD) result which was stated as:

“Public sector OECS Economic Union modernised and strengthened by human resource development, information and communications technologies inputs, public/private dialogues and enhanced transparency and accountability programmes via:

* Improved public sector management, budgeting, debt management, and revenue policy formulation, introduction of the value-added tax, financial supervision and collection of economic statistics.
* Enhanced public sector capacity in OECS countries for project management, implementation and evaluation. “

In order to contribute to the achievement of these results CARTAC provided technical services in five core areas, each of which have specific objectives:

* Public finance management (PFM);
* Tax/customs policy and administration;
* Financial sector regulation and supervision, including off-shore financial operations;
* Economic and financial statistics; and
* Macroeconomic programming and policy analysis.

**Key Project Developments**

**Results-Based Monitoring and Reporting**

Over the 10 year project duration, two CARTAC mid-term reviews pointed to the need to introduce CARTAC specific results based (RBM) monitoring framework to more accurately measure and present CARTAC impacts and national and regional levels outcomes. The Project Steering Committee endorsed this recommendation and mandated that this be addressed in the preparation of the document for the extension of CARTAC to Phase III over the period (2008-2010). In this regard UNDP supported the first consultancy to support the design of a results-based monitoring framework to reflect capacity building and sustainability results, taking into consideration RBM reporting platforms accepted and used by most donors.

CARTAC also supported an RBM assessment with recommendations that resulted in the adaptation of existing reporting frameworks providing CARTAC programmes results that included gender outcomes. The following recommendations were made:

* Replacement of One of the Semi Annual Activity Report with an Annual Report which gives more information on results of CARTAC activities.
* Preparation of Annual Work Plans instead of Semi Annual work plans which can be used to match Annual Reports and determine whether objectives were met.
* Preparation of An Annual Monitoring/Results Framework which will highlight the results of CARTAC Programming using specified indicators.
* Monitoring and Evaluation Plan which will include a Tracer Study of capacity building initiatives as part of the next Mid-term review exercise and Annual Survey of Beneficiary Sentiments.

**Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation**

This UNDP project evaluation will be results-oriented end-of Project Evaluation which will address the key goals which will:

1. determine whether the results as identified by each of the three phases were achieved;
2. identify lessons learned for wider UNDP project management and delivery application, specifically providing recommendations for the future use of UNDP agency executed guidelines and modalities for regional projects with national outcomes;
3. review the role and added value of the UNDP support to the CARTAC project vis-à-vis UNDP’s capacity building mandate ;
4. Assess the appropriateness of UNDP´s partnership strategy to the regional project modality

The evaluation will take place between mid November and end December 2011.

The evaluation will assess the **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability** of the CARTAC project and its contribution to outcome level results. Specifically the evaluation will examine the following aspects[[3]](#footnote-3):

* **Changes in context and review of assumptions (relevance – have the right things been done?)***:* The CARTAC project in its 4rd Phase. The economic and political conditions that led to the original Project design and implementation have changed substantially. This phase takes account of COFAP decision to use IMF Fund modalities vis-à-vis the UNDP cost-sharing project modality. What are the implications of these changes at national and regional levels and has the project been able to respond to these changes? What internal and external factors have influenced the ability of beneficiary groups to fully utilize the technical assistance provided by CARTAC?
* **Assessment of outcome/impact (effectiveness)**:The IMF executed CARTAC project provided the Caribbean Region with technical expertise designed to:
1. build capacity of beneficiary countries and support the improvement of the quality of policy-making and implementation
2. address the emerging challenges to fiscal and debt sustainability, financial sector development and overall macroeconomic management for sustained growth and development.

Therefore, this end-of-project evaluation will take into account the following:

1. What has been CARTAC’s performance with respect to the projected performance indicators and agreed responsibilities with respect to program implementation?
2. Is the results based management framework fully operational and effective?
3. What has been the impact of CARTAC? To what extent the CARTAC project has contributed to key outcome level results?
4. What progress towards the expected results has been achieved (strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, problems, causes)?
5. How could the impact of CARTAC’s programme have been expanded within a capacity building framework? Within a Human Development framework? And with a RBM focused report framework?
6. The value-added of the CARTAC programme in comparison with single donor projects. To what extent gender issues have been incorporated in the CARTAC project?
7. Has the partnership strategy been appropriate? How effective has been the use of UNDP agency executed modality?

**Achievement of projected performance indicators and targets (efficiency):**

Given that approximately USD 60 million has been expended over the lifetime of the project, this evaluation should include a cost/benefit and TA delivery efficiency[[4]](#footnote-4)analysis of the delivery of services and the effectiveness of the CARTAC model. Is the mode of delivery of technical assistance appropriate and best use of resources?

 Has the project been implemented according to the time line and costs estimated? Was there effective use of regional partnerships t to optimize pooled resources. From a financial perspective, were there benefits from use of the multidonor modality toward achievement of the desired outcomes? Did this effectively leverage the substantive capacities of the partners involved?

* **Sustainability***:* The evaluation will reflect on previous CARTAC’s review reports on sustainability and project delivery issues such as levels of delivery of technical assistance and donor support sustainability and proposals for cost recovery reviews that informed the formulation of Phase IV.

**Methodology**

The evaluators will design the methodology for the end-of-project evaluation. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.

It is suggested that the evaluation methodology will build on the 2009 ADR for Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean[[5]](#footnote-5) which offers evidence-based research on UNDP´s context and contribution at the outcome level. It is expected that evaluators will conduct a participatory end of project results focused evaluationthat will involve project implementers and stakeholder organizations (CARTAC, IMF, and UNDP, OECS and ECCB), key donors (CIDA, DFID, EU and CDB) and target beneficiaries in all key evaluation tasks.

The exercise will entail a combination of desk reviews and document analysis, and consultations with key stakeholders. In the case of the desk reviews and document analysis, particular emphasis will be paid to the Assessment of Development Results (2009) for the UNDP Office for Barbados and OECS, the three independent Mid-Term Reviews of the CARTAC project, the Polius and Jenson Reports on Results Based Monitoring and Reporting (2008) and the Report on the Review of CARTAC Governance and other recent CARTAC review reports as requested by the CARTAC Steering Committee.

The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations should be validated. The evaluation should reflect the principles of Managing for Development Results (MfDR), and it is expected that the process supports planning, monitoring and evaluation capacity building. The conceptual framework for the evaluation should be in line with the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009). The evaluation should apply the ethical and quality principles of the United Nations Evaluation Group, and the evaluators are expected to agree with the Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System.

**Deliverables**

The deliverables are as follows:

* Inception Report - Evaluation framework/design and implementation plan

An inception report should be prepared by the revision team before going into the full fledged evaluation exercise. The report should contain an evaluation matrix that displays for each of the evaluation criteria, the questions and sub questions that the evaluation will answer, and for each question, the data that will be collected to inform that question and the methods that will be used to collect that data[[6]](#footnote-6) . In addition, the inception report should make explicit the underlying theory or assumptions about how each data element will contribute to understanding the development results—attribution, contribution, process, implementation and so forth—and the rationale for data collection, analysis and reporting methodologies selected. It should also include a proposed schedule of tasks/activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.

Draft evaluation report

Final Evaluation Report The final report should be 50 paged analytical report, excluding annexes, detailing key findings, good practices and clear recommendations. The report should be presented in English. The Evaluation report format should meet with the standard Evaluation Report Template of the UNDP and quality Standards established[[7]](#footnote-7)

**Competencies of the Evaluation Team**

The MTE team will consist of a maximum of 2 consultants, who have the following competencies:

Advanced University Degree in Social Sciences (or other relevant field) with at least seven years proven experience in areas of planning, monitoring, evaluation, and analysis (for Team Leader: at least ten years experience)

Demonstrated cutting-edge technical planning and evaluation capacity

**Indicative Schedule**

* Inception Report 05 days
* Desk Review and Documentation Analysis……………………….………………...05 days
* Field Research 15 days
* Draft evaluation report 10 days
* Final Report 3 days
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