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# Introduction

## Background and context

The islands of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) and Barbados share the common characteristics of small land masses, open economies, vulnerability to natural hazards, a historical dependence on agricultural products and preferential trade agreements, and a cultural and political heritage derived from being past or present dependencies of Britain. The OECS was established in 1981 under the Treaty of Basseterre in response to the need for an arrangement in which the countries could cooperate in external affairs representation after independence, given their limited human and financial resources. The grouping currently comprises 9 members - Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia and St Vincent and the Grenadines, and the overseas British territories of Monserrat, Anguilla and the British Virgin Islands. The 1981 Treaty

was revised in 2010[[1]](#footnote-1), to effectively establish a Single Financial and Economic Space within which goods, people and capital move freely; and harmonize monetary and fiscal policies. Member States are expected continue to adopt a common approach to trade, health, education and environment, as well as to the development of vital sectors such as agriculture, tourism and energy. The OECS continues to be part of the broader Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and at Twenty-Fourth Inter-Sessional Meeting of the Conference of Heads of Government of CARICOM held in Port-au-Prince, Haiti, from 18–19 February 2013, CARICOM leaders adopted the OECS’ Revised Treaty of Basseterre into CARICOM’s Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas.

Although Barbados is not a member of the OECS, it is in the Eastern Caribbean, and is grouped with the OECS to form a sub region that facilitates economies of scale for the countries, and the delivery of international development assistance such as that provided by the UN and other development agencies. Like other Small Island Developing States (SIDS), the countries of the Caribbean sub region are endowed with valuable resources, including oceans, coastal environments, biodiversity and resourceful populations. However, they are challenged by their narrow resource bases and the tendency to overuse and cause depletion e.g of fresh water and coastal resources; threats to their natural resources, built infrastructure and the populations from the effects of climate change; high levels of dependence on imported fuel and international trade, and therefore vulnerability to global market forces; locations remote from major markets resulting high freight costs; small domestic markets; inefficient public administration and infrastructure, and limited institutional capacities. Caribbean SIDS in particular are beset by high debt, stagnating growth, and burgeoning crime rates related in great part to several countries being major trans-shipment points for drugs passing from South America to the markets in North America. In solidarity with other SIDS, and in order to address their own development issues, the Caribbean islands have been active participants in the establishment and ratification of the various SIDS treaties and agreements, including the Barbados Plan of Action(1994), the Mauritius Strategy (2005) and their respective follow up/review actions, and most recently the Samoa Pathway (2014).

All the countries within the sub-region are assessed by the World Bank to be Middle to High income, and on the UNDP’s Human Development Index (2014), they fall within the range from 0.714 in St Lucia, which is categorized as “medium human development”, to 0.774 in Antigua & Barbuda and 0.777 for Barbados which are “high human development”. In many respects, the classifications of the countries as “medium to high income” and “ medium to high” are at variance with the realities on the ground in several countries, where large segments of the population (e.g youth, rural dwellers) live in poverty, and there exists “structural and entrenched development challenges at the macroeconomic, institutional and household, and individual levels”.[[2]](#footnote-2) Further, despite the seeming similarities between the respective countries’ classifications, there are significant disparities between them. For example, the GDP per capita ranges from US$9,000 in St Lucia to US$18,000 in BVI and US$10,000 in Barbados; the poverty rate ranges from 14 per cent in Barbados to 39 per cent in Dominica; and crime rates, fast becoming a defining factor in the regions’ development, range from 11 per 100,000 in Antigua and Barbuda to a high of 27 per 100,000 in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

In the post-independence period (1966-1981), much of the development of these countries was tied to significant agricultural activity, specifically bananas (Windward Islands) and sugar cane (Barbados, St Kitts & Nevis), the export of which was facilitated by preferential access to European markets as negotiated between the European Union and the ACP under successive Lome Conventions (co-operation agreements between the then European Community and ACP countries, which commenced in 1975 and expired in 2000). Under the trade agreement component of the Convention, ACP states were exempted from tariffs and other barriers created for the protection of EU markets from cheaper imports. All the countries of the sub region had signed the Convention by 1985 (Lome III) and the arrangement remained intact until the late 1990’s when they were challenged under the new World Trade Organisation(WTO) rules. The preferential status was extended for a limited time under the Cotonou Agreement (2000), the successor to Lome, and phased out in 2007.

The financial crises of 2007-2008 also affected the sub-region significantly, and these effects have been exacerbated by natural disasters in 2010 (Barbados, St Lucia, and St Vincent and the Grenadines), 2012 (St Lucia) and 2013 (St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, and the Commonwealth of Dominica) which caused massive infrastructure damage, the loss of crops and livelihoods. The result is that while there has been, for some countries, significant progress toward meeting the Millennium Development Goals: MDG 2 (achieve universal primary education), 3 (promote gender equality and empower women), MDG 4 (reduce child mortality), MDG 5 (improve maternal health), MDG 6 (combat HIV, AIDS, malaria and other diseases), MDG 7 (ensure environmental sustainability) - there has been some reversal of progress in some countries. Currently, countries within the sub-region are among the most indebted in the world, with more than a half of them having debt to gross domestic product (GDP) ratios of more than 70%, and weak and contracting domestic financial sectors. In addition, climate change and increasingly severe natural hazards are expected to threaten development gains by causing deterioration and destruction of the natural resource base and severely affecting livelihoods and food security.

The impact of these stressors on the social fabric of these countries is considerable. Inequality and poverty are significant and result from a mixture of primary factors including the macroeconomic situation, vulnerabilities to natural hazards, and all the factors characteristic of SIDS; but also relate to imperfections in the labour market, and continued stratification regarding class, status, power, education, access to resources and income[[3]](#footnote-3). The poverty phenomenon in the sub-region is therefore “complex and multi-dimensional, with adverse effects on individual and community health and well-being”[[4]](#footnote-4). The rise in crime and violence, is both a result of, and a contributor to the cycle of poverty and inequality. A 2008 ECLAC Report[[5]](#footnote-5) noted that the linkage between poverty, crime and violence is “*based on two central arguments that (i) crime and violence can retard growth and development and lead to increasing poverty and inequality and (ii) that inequality, relative deprivation and social exclusion contribute to increasing levels of crime and violence”.*

Crime and violence is attributed to significant numbers of disaffected, unemployed youth, gang activity, drug trafficking, and the ready accessibility of illegal firearms. Homicide rates, both domestic and gang related, have increased and there is evidence that this is eroding socioeconomic development opportunities and threatening the region’s performance and potential to achieve international development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).[[6]](#footnote-6) Of significance is the high level of gender based violence(GBV) that continues despite strong legal frameworks to address it, however there is a lack of national services to support victims.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been operational in Barbados and the OECS since 1980. Programme activities are developed through negotiations at the country and regional levels. The agency operates in a multi-country context to create an enabling environment where the 10 represented national governments have the capacities for “inclusive and sustainable human development; meet their regional commitments, and internationally agreed goals including the Millennium Development Goals”. Within the limitations of having just 5 of the 10 countries as National Contributing Countries (NCCs), the agency maintains a focus on delivery of policy and knowledge advisory services that facilitate poverty reduction, improved democratic governance, sound environmental management, climate resilience, options for sustainable energy and building resilience to natural and man-made hazards.

Informed by a comprehensive analysis of the development context of the sub region[[7]](#footnote-7) and consultations with governments in the subregion, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012-2016 was established to support the ten (10) programme countries in their quest to address their development priorities including persistent inequality, structural challenges and their inherent vulnerabilities.

The Outcome areas of the UNDAF are:

1. Environment, energy, climate change and disaster risk reduction
2. Enabling environment of effective economic and social governance and enhanced security
3. Social protection and poverty reduction with a focus on vulnerable groups
4. Food and nutrition security
5. Public health within context of the development agenda using a rights-based approach, maintaining focus on HIV/AIDS and non-communicable diseases
6. Capacity building and institutional strengthening

The Sub-regional Programme Document for Barbados and the OECS (SPD 2012-2016)[[8]](#footnote-8), is based on the relevant programmatic areas outlined in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012-2016. Both the formulation of 2012-2016 SPD and UNDAF for Barbados and the OECS were supported by extensive in-country consultative processes that involved governments, civil society groups and other stakeholders.

The main Programme elements are described below:

1. Cross cutting issues – Gender equality and capacity development
2. Poverty reduction and MDG achievement
3. Governance
4. Environment, energy and climate change
5. Disaster risk reduction

The Multi Country Programme Action Plan (MCPAP, 2012-2016) is based upon and further elaborates the SPD, 2012-2016 which was endorsed by the Governments and approved by the UNDP Executive Board in June 2011. It takes the UNDAF, and the commitment of the UN system to “Deliver as One” into consideration, and builds upon the experience gained, and progress made during the implementation of the UNDP Subregional Programme 2006-2009, extended to 2011, in the provision of services from strategic regional interventions to support capacity development, technical, policy advisory and implementation support alignment with the corporate priorities presented in the UNDP Strategic Plan 2008-2013. The MCPAP is agreed to by the Governments of Barbados, the Member States of the OECS and UNDP, each acknowledging their responsibilities in its implementation.

## Purpose of the Evaluation

As stated by the terms of reference (ToR), the **Mid Term Evaluation of the Subregional Programme** will assess UNDP’s progress towards achieving the programme outcomes and the extent to which UNDP has contributed to these outcomes through its project and non-project activities.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The evaluation will make recommendations for how UNDP Barbados and the OECS can align to meet the requirements of the new UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017), and improve the prospects of achieving the stated SPD outcomes through adjusting its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and management structures. Also, the evaluation could assist with inputs to re-adjust the Sub-regional Programme during the remaining period.

## Scope of evaluation[[10]](#footnote-10)

In order to achieve this, the evaluation team will distill the projects within the Poverty and Inclusive Governance, Energy, Environment and Climate Change, and Disaster Risk Reduction thematic areas and assess how the combined actions have contributed to outcome level changes as outlined in the Sub-regional Programme Document (SPD). Specifically, the midterm evaluation will seek to:

* Review the status of the outcomes and the key factors that affect (both positively and negatively) these outcomes;
* Review and assess the Programmes’ partnership with governments, civil society, other international organisations and the private society, and provide recommendations for how these partnerships can be strengthened;
* Taking into account the 2014 - 2017 UNDP Strategic Plan, UNDP Gender Strategy and the UNDP Youth Strategy, this evaluation will provide recommendations for the future direction of the Sub-regional Programme, enabling the UNDP Barbados and the OECS Subregional Office (SRO) to contribute to the achievement of the stated outcomes in these strategy documents.
* Identify proposals for synergies with other practices areas as a way of implementing an issues-based approach to the UNDP’s development work; and
* Serve as inputs into developing the Theories of Change required to achieve the stated outcomes for remainder of the programme cycle.

# Evaluation Methodology

Integrated interventions such as the SPD 2012-2016 encompass heterogeneous but complementary interventions with common objectives. The sub-regional programme evaluation complexity is derived from different elements that the methodology will address:

* The SPD delivers outcomes at the country, multi country , sub-regional and thematic levels
* Implementation of the programme in several contexts (countries with similarities but different contexts), with a range of target groups
* Several topics and activities are implemented under the same intervention
* External factors affecting the management and outcomes (e.g. political will, capacity of the partners at the national or sub-regional level, economic aspects, culture, etc.)
* The "products" and effects generated sometimes lack a monetary or quantitative basis of assessment and therefore are often difficult to express in terms of quantities (e.g. capacity development, civil society engagement, target groups’ empowerment, lack of data/research etc.)

Due to this complexity, the basic purpose of the methodology is to establish a method that will allow the evaluation team to answer the evaluation questions stated in the ToR and to come to an overall assessment.

This will be an intermediate evaluation, with an integrated approach of the Subregional Programme It will take stock of achievements to date, identify and document lessons learned from the first years of the intervention implementation, and to inform appropriate adjustments as necessary in the elements of the ongoing intervention in keeping with the realities of contextual developments. This evaluation will also assess and propose how the programme areas can work better and in a unified way –noting recent changes, eg. the Governance and Poverty Reduction Areas were re-structures recently to become inclusive governance and sustainable human development.

## Intervention logic – Theory of Change

The intervention logic or change theory seeks to explain why, how and under what conditions the expected effects of the programme will occur. It establishes the assumptions underlying an intervention in terms of a phased sequence of causes and effects implicit in the SPD logic[[11]](#footnote-11), and includes the activities and expected outputs, results and impacts of the intervention.

A Results and Resources Framework (RRF) for the Programme is provided in the Annex to the Draft Sub regional Programme document, and this will constitute the starting point for the evaluation. It will be reviewed with the intention to determine if this was the definitive document guiding the intervention. In addition an assessment will be undertaken to see how this RRF links with the higher level results frameworks such as the UNDAF results framework and that of the overall UNDP Strategic Plan, as well as any thematic results frameworks that may exist.

It will also be necessary to reconstruct the intervention logic of the UNDP intervention in order to understand which effects are expected and therefore which specific evaluation questions and sub questions are to be asked.

The process to reconstruct the intervention logic will be

* Collect the official documents establishing the intervention and allocating resources.
* Identify the main activities.
* Identify the objectives.
* Translate the objectives into expected results and impacts.
* Connect the activities to the expected impacts by reconstructing the logical cause-and-effect relationship (if… then…).
* Check that the cause-and-effect relationships are logical, i.e. considered as plausible in the light of available knowledge.
* Discuss the reconstructed logic with a few key informants (designers and managers) and with the experts.
* Present and discuss the intervention logic during the visit.

The evaluation will dwell on aspects related to the outcome’s implementation (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability) with the aim of providing management feedback; and/or identify transferrable good practices to projects; and the remaining phase of the SPD.[[12]](#footnote-12)

## Data collection strategy

As stated above, the evaluation is designed to allow conclusions to be drawn based on triangulation of evidence from different methods and sources (primary and secondary). In the initial stages, the evaluation will rely on already existing documentation. To complement this information, the evaluation will adopt a three-tiered strategy to collect primary data to ensure both sufficient coverage (breadth) and insight into the role and functioning (depth) of the outcome; a general survey to stakeholders; interviews through on-line/telephone interviews; and in-depth face-to-face interviews during the country visits.

**Initial interviews with the UNDP:** The evaluation began by discussing with the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative the context of the Sub regional Programme and how this links into the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan, and the current UNDAF. The expectations of the evaluation were shared and approaches as to how this might be met, and documents were shared. A revision of the timeline for the evaluation was also agreed to with allowances for delays in start-up of the contract, and the intervening holiday period.

It is expected that once the Inception report is completed and accepted, further discussions with the Deputy RR as well as the respective UNDP sub regional Programme Managers will be carried out.

**Desk review**: The evaluation team has collected and reviewed some initial documentation and will continue the process with additional documents including the following:

* Existing Results framework, and other planning tools e.g. detailed work plan / project plans
* Project documents
* Baseline data and survey instruments used (as relevant)
* Past evaluation documents
* Progress reports, Mid Term and Annual Reports if available
* Background documents, country and sub regional statistics, etc
* UNDP strategy documents
* National, subregional and regional policy and legislative documents
* Policy and legislative documents related to related to thematic areas
* Other published documents

**Interviews:** Informant interviews and consultations will be a key source of information to complement and validate the qualitative information gathered through the desk review and meta-analysis of key documents. These will provide in-depth information, which will allow analysis related to SPD´s design, process and results. Efforts will be made to ensure a range of voices is represented covering all the stakeholder categories.

Among the persons to be interviewed are the following:

* + UNDP Staff, Sub Regional Office, Barbados
  + OECS Commission, Programme Unit
  + OECS Functional Cooperation and Programme Management Unit and the social development unit
  + Various funding partners
  + Project/Programme managers
  + Other development agencies in the respective thematic/Programme areas
  + Key national and regional partners
  + Project consultants
  + Direct and indirect beneficiaries
  + Donors in the sector
  + Civil society groups
  + Steering Committee members of projects

These interviews will be carried out either by Skype and telephone, or face to face, where possible.

**Field visits**

**Visits to the sub regional duty station will facilitate** In-depth interviews of both UN staff and other stakeholders in Barbados. The consultants will also visit 2 selected OECS countries together with Barbados to observe first-hand progress and achievements made and to collect best practices and lessons learned.

The countries selection criteria should include:

* Cost of the interventions – level of presence
* Availability of information sources and/or access to key stakeholders
* Strength of the projects (countries with good practices to learn from)
* Weakness of the projects (countries that faced obstacles and implementation shortcomings)
* Centrality of the country intervention to the overall UNDAF and expected impact on national/regional priorities

**Direct observation**

Observation serves to better understand the nature, problems, and successes of some programme activities and processes. Due to time and resources constraints, observation will be selective and will involve identification[[13]](#footnote-13) of a few activities when feasible and paying special attention to management processes and stakeholders’ behaviors that are central to the evaluation questions.

**General survey**

An online survey will be conducted to collect feedback from stakeholders with access to Internet. It will consist of 10 or less questions on the perceived performance, quality and results from the initiative. It is important to not duplicate efforts with similar surveys and rather complement them.

**Expected support**

The evaluator team will expect support from the UNDP in Barbados during the field mission in the following areas:

* Availability to interact with the evaluators for rapid triangulation in data collection
* Provision of necessary documentation
* Making initial contact with respective focal points, partners and key stakeholders and soliciting their support for the field visits
* Assisting with finalization of the meeting/interview agenda for the field mission.
* If at all possible, transport to the regions
* Responsiveness to the draft Final report and provision of timely feedback

A mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches will be used to analyze data and assess the status of the outputs. The above data collection methods combined with the evaluation matrix[[14]](#footnote-14) will ensure a robust evaluation method, which permits reaching evidence-based conclusions.

The consultancy aims to make recommendations from solid conclusions, evidence and fieldwork. The conclusions and recommendations will be derived from demonstrations in field, and data/information generated by the application of appropriate methodological tools suited to the degree of complexity of the intervention, the nature of the information being sought and the diversity of partners. The proposed methodology will make it possible to sustain the thesis of the consultancy with findings from desk review, interviews and fieldwork. Field work will be a ground for (i) cross-checking reference information with stakeholders at the national and sub-regional levels; (ii) complementing the desk review information and secondary sources of information; (iii) identifying elements of success and establishing the strengths or good practices; (iv) identifying difficulties in the operation; and (v) making recommendations for UNDP.

Figure 1 Primary data collection strategy

Ilustración 2. Evaluation strategy by country

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Countries to be contacted through:** | **Online survey** | **Online interview** | **Email** | **Field visit[[15]](#footnote-15)** |
| Barbados | X |  | X | X |
| Anguilla | X | X | X |  |
| British Virgin Islands | X | X | X |  |
| Antigua and Barbuda | X | X | X |  |
| St. Christopher (St. Kitts) | X | X | X |  |
| Dominica | X | X | X |  |
| Grenada | X | X | X | X |
| Montserrat | X | X | X |  |
| Saint Lucia | X | X | X | X |
| St. Vincent and the Grenadines | X | X | X |  |

Given the possible confluence of different interventions and the work of other partners, *attribution* of development changes to the SPD is not likely to be feasible, and attempting to do so could be inappropriate. The evaluation will therefore consider *contribution* of the programme to the intended change stated in the programme document and seek to explain how UNDP contributed to the observed results. The assessments of contribution will be tested by trying to answer: ‘What would not have happened without the UNDP?’ rather than answering: ‘How important was the Programme in engendering a particular result?’[[16]](#footnote-16)

## Evaluation criteria and questions[[17]](#footnote-17)

In assessing the achievement of programme outcomes, the evaluation will use the following criteria and evaluation questions defined by the ToR:

**Relevance:**

* Are the stated outcomes and indicators appropriate for the development situation in Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean?
* To what extent are the focus areas relevant to the development needs of Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean and the 2014 to 2017 UNDP Strategic Plan during the remainder of the programme cycle? What strategies should UNDP undertake to achieve intended development results? What are the priority issues that UNDP could focus on in the short-term?
* Does UNDP programme address urgent and emerging priorities, which were not originally in the SPD, such as gradually integrating the emerging post-2015 development agenda, as well as disaster risk reduction, climate change citizen security?
* How should they be reflected in the results matrix?
* How has UNDP observed its commitment to addressing cross-cutting issues such as human rights based approaches, gender mainstreaming, capacity building and knowledge management?
* Are the monitoring indicators appropriate to measure achievement of the outcome or is there is need for improvement?

**Efficiency**

* To what extent have the programme and project outputs resulted from economic use of resources?
* With the existing interventions in partnership with other actors and stakeholders, has UNDP achieved the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs – or whether additional resources are required and new or changed interventions are needed in the future?
* To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
* Are there any synergies between UNDP, other UN Agencies and donors?
* Are there any gaps in terms of time, resources, capacities, etc. that may prevent the achievement of the outcomes?

**Effectiveness**

* Can UNDP’s outputs and other interventions be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcomes?
* What progress has been made in terms of achieving UNDP outputs (including an analysis of both project activities and soft assistance)?
* What are the key outputs that have been or likely to be produced by UNDP to contribute to the outcomes?
* What are the factors (negative and positive) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs?
* What were the positive and negative, intended or unintended, changes contributed by UNDP’s work?
* What has been the quality of output and outcome level monitoring and how has it contributed to programme achievements? How have corresponding outputs delivered by UNDP affective the outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective? How effectively were project evaluations used by the subregional office?
* How could the SPD/MCPAP implementation could be improved over the next two and a half years?
* How has UNDP observed it commitment to addressing cross-cutting issues such as human rights based approaches, gender mainstreaming, capacity building and knowledge management?

**Sustainability:**

* What is the prospect of the sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcomes? Provide recommendations for ensuring sustainability.
* Indicate if the scaling up/replication of the projects or methodology is feasible and make recommendations to ensure the same; assess how well UNDP replicated or extends projects including timings and change in project design etc.
* To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national and sub-regional stakeholders been developed or implemented?
* To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?

**For the specific approach to answer the evaluations questions and addressing the criteria, the team has prepared an evaluation matrix with questions, sub questions, key aspects and sources of information** (see Annex 2).

## 2.4 Data analysis process

Following completion of the main data collection phase, the following steps will be taken:

* Findings: Corroborate facts and statements
* Assessments: Examination of the findings against evaluation criteria
* Analysis: Identification of factors behind the assessments made
* Conclusions: General statements about the value and performance of the programme, and common factors and features of it that affected its value and performance
* Recommendations: to address each of the conclusions
* Lessons learned and best practices identified: emergent topics stemming from the evaluation that may have wider applicability

## 2.5 Validation and report preparation process

The preliminary findings will be validated during the evaluation process and confirmed during the field visits. As sharing intermediate conclusions with the UNDP is a critical part of the analysis process, a debriefing exercise will be carried out at the end of the field visits. The debriefing, which will be in the format of **a Powerpoint** presentation, will highlight key findings as well as some preliminary conclusions and recommendations, and will provide the basis of discussions with the UNDP. The comments, inputs and feedback will be addressed in the **Draft Final Report** which will be submitted for further validation and comment. Taking into account the additional comments and inputs received, the report will be adjusted as necessary, and integrated into a **Final Report**.

## 2.6 Risks

The various risks associated with the Evaluation are listed below, together with possible Mitigative Measures.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| RISKS | MITIGATIVE MEASURES |
| 1. Availability of focal points, identified interviewees to meet over the allocated period | Extended advance notice will be provided to identified interviewees, and in the event face to face appointments cannot be kept, these will be rescheduled and carried out by phone or Skype as necessary. |
| 1. Difficulties in accessing necessary data and/or delays in receiving necessary information from identified informants | The UNDP Sub Regional Office will be solicited to use their influence to leverage the full support and participation of  stakeholders in all aspects of the evaluation |
| 1. Inadequacies in the baselines developed at programme outset; | Data from pre project situational reports, and anecdotal  information will be solicited from key informants, and  used to construct a proxy baseline condition that existed prior to the Programme start |
| 1. Absence of sufficiently rigorous monitoring protocols and systematised reporting on the respective interventions | Where there are information gaps, there will be greater emphasis on the information derived from key informants, and the information will be validated by triangulation to the extent possible |
| 1. Balancing regional perspectives with thematic assessments as well as country specifics within the same evaluation exercise over a limited time frame | The work effort will be divided between the evaluators so that all perspectives can be adequately considered at the various levels and within the respective thematic areas; |
| 1. Reticence on the part of informants regarding the true status of project outcomes due to fears of adverse repercussions | Participants in the evaluation will be briefed on the purpose of the exercise, and be assured that the evaluation is not a personal performance assessment |

## 2.7. Stakeholders map (provisional)

The main stakeholders identified for this evaluation at the different levels include but are not limited to the se shown in the matrix. They are mapped against their respective interests. The map is provisional because detailed project information is not yet in hand.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholders | **Interest** | | | | | |
| **Project/ Programme Manage-ment** | **Project partner (funding agency, institutional support)** | **Influencers (Media etc)** | **Beneficiary** | **National /Regional governments, Policy makers** | **Governance** |
| UNDP Sub Regional Office, Barbados |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OECS Commission |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other UN Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Development Assistance agencies (GIZ, EU) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional organisations (eg CARICOM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional NGOs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National governments/  government agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National NGOs, CSOs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project  Steering Committees |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Programme of work

### Team composition

The team comprises **Oscar Huertes Dias, Team Leader** **and Valerie Gordon, National Consultant**. The evaluators will collaborate on all aspects of the evaluation, however based on their respective skills sets, they will take ultimate responsibility for different thematic areas. Oscar Dias will take the lead on projects within the Governance and Poverty Reduction thematic areas, while Valerie Gordon will address projects within the Energy and Environment and the Crisis Prevention and Recovery areas.

### Phases of work

The Evaluation will be implemented in three phases

Phase 1 Inception Period - to include initial desk review of critical documents, interviews with the UNDP, and preparation of the Inception report

Phase 2 Data Collection - to include interviews with UNDP Staff, Key stakeholders, partners and project beneficiaries. Field visits to some project locations will take place in this phase

Phase 3 Data Analysis - The data collected will be synthesized and initial findings shared with the UNDP

Phase 4 Report Preparation – The Draft report will be prepared, and submitted for feedback; the Final Report will be prepared taking into consideration the inputs and feedback re

### Provisional workplan showing person days

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TASKS** | **PERSON DAYS** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1** | | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** | **21** | **22** | **23** | **24** | **25** | **26** | **27** | **28** | **29** | **30** | **31** | **32** | **33** | **34** | **35** | **36** | **37** | **38** | **39** | **40** |
| **Inception Meeting- UNDP Staff Dec 17 and Jan 8th r** |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Desk Review of project documents etc, ETC reports, background papers (**EVAL TEAM)** |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development of Evaluation Plan, and research tools; Preparation of Inception Report **(EVAL TEAM)** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MILESTONE 1 - Submission of Inception Report Dec 23, 2014** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review of project documents, preparation of provisional field agenda, **Finalisation of Inception Report - Jan 9, 2015** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site visits, Interviews meetings, focus groups (Barbados, Grenada, St.Lucia)  **Jan 15-25 (+/-)\_** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MILESTONE 2 - Debriefing in Barbados (Powerpoint report** ) |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data Analysis and Preparation of draft report |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MILESTIO NE 3 - Submission of draft report Feb 6** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collation of comments from the UNDP and finalisation of Report |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MILESTONE 4 Submission of Draft Final Report Feb 20, 2015** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**KEY:** Home days; Field days; Milestones

# Annexes

# Terms of reference

## Evaluation Matrix

The information matrix is useful to finalize the overall evaluation method in a way which cuts across the evaluation questions and which makes a good enough mix of evaluation tools, considering the available time and resources. The method draws up the list of all evaluation tools suggested in the tables. Each tool is then considered from the viewpoint of its capacity to help answering several questions and sub-questions. **It is important to note that these questions are only indicative and should be tailored in terms of language, tone, style and format to match the audience, for this the consultants will develop evaluation protocols.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATION MATRIX** | | | | |
| **Questions to be addressed by outcome-level evaluation** | **Sub-questions** | **What to look for** | **Data sources** | **Data collection methods** |
| **RELEVANCE.** Relevance concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues. Relevance concerns the congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the program planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries. It also incorporates the concept of responsiveness—that is, the extent to which UNDP was able to respond to changing and emerging development priorities and needs in a responsive manner: | | | | |
| * Are the stated outcomes and indicators appropriate for the development situation in Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean? * Are the monitoring indicators appropriate to measure achievement of the outcome or is there is need for improvement? * To what extent are the focus areas relevant to the development needs of Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean and the 2014 to 2017 UNDP Strategic Plan during the remainder of the programme cycle? What strategies should UNDP undertake to achieve intended development results? What are the priority issues that UNDP could focus on in the short-term? * Does the UNDP programme address urgent and emerging priorities, which were not originally in the SPD, such as gradually integrating the emerging post-2015 development agenda, as well as disaster risk reduction, climate change, citizen security? How should they be reflected in the results matrix? * How has UNDP observed its commitment to addressing cross-cutting issues such as human rights based approaches, gender mainstreaming, capacity building and knowledge management? | * To what extent was the programme designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated, as part of a collaborative process among all relevant stakeholders? * The decision making for the Programme is based on what type of information? (indicators, social data, surveys, studies) * Is information on performance and achieved results accessible to all stakeholders? * Is the project reported on results or activities? * To what extent was the program the best option to respond to development challenges, as stated in project document and as reflected in country-level project work plans? * What was the added value from the Programme? * Is the initiative aligned with sub-regional and national strategies? * Is it consistent with human development needs and the specific development challenges in the countries? * To what extent has UNDP adopted participatory approaches in planning and delivery of the initiative and what has been feasible in the country context? * How flexible and adaptable was the program to address the changing dynamics in the countries? * Are UNDP’s approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to address cross-cutting issues such as human rights based approaches, gender mainstreaming, capacity building and knowledge management | * M&E systems, roles and processes * Mechanisms the project have put in place to monitor implementation and its related effectiveness * Alignment of the project with sub-region al and national priorities * Prioritization process * Program flexibility * Response capacity * The ways the project address the human development needs of intended beneficiaries * To what extent target groups and other stakeholders been involved in project design? | * M&E templates * Program key documents * Results frame-works, other intervention logic models * CO, key stakeholders, Governments * Progress reports * Interviews with beneficiaries * Online survey   UNDAF document, UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017.  UNDP Youth Strategy, UNDP Gender Strategy, MDG’s, National development strategy documents, CPAPs, MCAP  Interviews with key partners and stakeholders | * Desk reviews of secondary data * Interviews of government partners * Interview with partners/service providers * Interviews with civil society actors * Field visits to selected projects-activities |
| **EFFICIENCY.** Efficiency measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Efficiency is important in ensuring that resources have been used appropriately and in highlighting more effective uses of resources: | | | | |
| * To what extent have the programme and project outputs resulted from economic use of resources? * With the existing interventions in partnership with other actors and stakeholders, has UNDP achieved the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs – or whether additional resources are required and new or changed interventions are needed in the future? * Are there any synergies between UNDP, other UN Agencies and donors? * To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time? * Are there any gaps in terms of time, resources, capacities, etc. that may prevent the achievement of the outcomes? | * To what extent was the structure of the programme efficient (organizational structure, management flow, decision-making, etc.) in comparison to the development results attained? * How efficient were the structures of the programme? (Hierarchy, roles, supervision chain) * Were the resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results? * To what extent and in what ways did national ownership – or the lack thereof – impact the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme? * Was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results? * How has the inter-agency work and UNCT assisted the efficiency of program delivery? * Were the UNDP activities, processes and results owned by the stakeholders? * Has the project or programme been implemented within deadline and cost estimates? Why? | * Cost-effectiveness * The circumstances giving rise to need for time extensions * The fund utilization (over-expenditure / under-expenditures) * Ensuring resources are concentrated on the most important initiatives (or whether they scattered/ spread thinly across initiatives) * UNDP added value to the process * Articulation * UN Synergies * Possible partnership alternatives * Delivery, implementation * Execution rates * Bottlenecks | * Programme documents * Progress reports * Project Work Plans, financial reports * Government partners * UNDP staff * Feedback, opinions of other UN agencies, other development agencies, project partners | * Desk reviews of secondary data * Interview Government partners and Development partners * Interviews with UNDP staff embers |
| * Interviews with other UN agencies, other development agencies, project partners |
| **EFFECTIVENESS.** Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the initiative’s intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved. | | | | |
| * Can UNDP’s outputs and other interventions be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcomes? * What progress has been made in terms of achieving UNDP outputs and outcomes (including an analysis of both project activities and soft assistance)? * What are the key outputs that have been or likely to be produced by UNDP to contribute to the outcomes? * What are the factors (negative and positive) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs? * What were the positive and negative, intended or unintended, changes contributed by UNDP’s work? * What has been the quality of output and outcome level monitoring and how has it contributed to programme achievements? How have corresponding outputs delivered by UNDP effective the outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective? How effectively were project evaluations used by the sub-region al office? * How could the SPD/MCPAP implementation could be improved over the next two and a half years? * How has UNDP observed it commitment to addressing cross-cutting issues such as human rights based approaches, gender mainstreaming, capacity building and knowledge management? | * To what extent have the objectives and expected results (outputs, outcomes), been clear, realistic and coherent in terms of contributing to the regional priorities and UNDP’s overarching strategies and policies? * Is there a clear theory of change for the program? * Does the value chain clearly specifies how the inputs turn into activities, outputs and outcomes? * To what extent and in what ways did the programme contribute to achieving the expected results? * What were the good practices, success stories, lessons learned and transferable examples? * What are the external and internal factors that +/- affect the program performance? * Were there any unintended results? (+/-) * Is there a proper M&E system to measure and report progress and results? * Are there clear M&E procedures, roles and proper tools? * Did the evaluation exercises influence strategic decision-making? * What lessons can be learned from the implementation in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in the future? * Evaluation recommendations * The extent to which the HD initiative is designed to appropriately incorporate in each outcome area contributions to attainment of gender equality? * ¿Which UNDP documents, tools, guidelines exist to equip the team to take gender and HR into account? * ¿Which data is generated to inform MS and management on HR / gender issues, e g when carrying out capacity building? ¿Who, within UNDP, is in charge of HR and gender? * Has UNDP invested in the sharing of best practices within the sub-region al office or with other offices | * Contribution * Intervention logic * Causality * Outcomes the program achieved * Outputs the program achieved * In addition to UNDP initiatives, the unanticipated/unintended (+ and - ) factors that may have affected the results * What couldn’t have been done without the UNDP * M&E usefulness for UNDP and other stakeholders * Proper output measurement * Evaluation role in management * Recommendations based on evidence, usefulness, and viability * Example(s) of how the program contributes to gender equality * HR approach * Capacity Building * Knowledge Management * Best practices identification and sharing. * Institutional memory. | * Progress reports on projects * UN staff * Development partners * Government partners * Beneficiaries * Products, publications * M&E tools and procedures * Project evaluations | * Desk reviews of secondary data * Interviews with Government partners, Development partners, UN staff, civil society partners, associations, and federations * Field visits to selected projects |
| **SUSTAINABILITY.** Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has ended. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future. | | | | |
| * What is the prospect of the sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcomes? Provide recommendations for ensuring sustainability. * Indicate if the scaling up/replication of the projects or methodology is feasible and make recommendations to ensure the same; assess how well UNDP replicated or extends projects including timings and change in project design etc. * To what extend has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national and sub-region al stakeholders been developed or implemented? * To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits? | * Where relevant, have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in key stakeholders? * Were initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks? * Did they include an exit strategy? * How does UNDP propose to exit from projects? * To what extent does the exit strategy take into account the following: * Political factors (support from national authorities) * Financial factors (available budgets) * Technical factors (skills and expertise needed) * How has UNDP approached the scaling up of successful pilot initiatives and catalytic projects? * Have donors stepped in to scale up initiatives? | * How has UNDP addressed the challenge of building national capacity in the face of high turnover of government officials? * Exit strategy (procedures and agreements defined for sustaining the program results in the future) * Unanticipated sustainability threats emerged during implementation * Actions have been taken to scale up the projects | * Progress reports on projects * UN staff * Development partners * Government partners | * Desk reviews of secondary data * Interviews of Government partners, Development partners, UN staff, civil society partners, associations, and federations * Field visits to selected projects |
|  |

## 3. Stakeholders map

The main stakeholders identified for this evaluation at the different levels include but are not limited to the following:

Sub Regional Level

* UNDP Staff, Sub Regional Office, Barbados
* OECS ~~Secretariat~~, Commission Programme Unit
* Regional Programme managers
* Other development assistance agencies in respective thematic/Programme areas
* Regional Civil Society Groups

At the country Level

* Key national and regional partners
* Project consultants
* Direct and indirect beneficiaries
* Donors in the sector
* Civil society groups, NGOs
* Steering Committee members

## 4. Evaluation tools

Evaluation tools will be used in order to collect primary and secondary data, to analyze data, and to formulate value judgments. Tools may vary from simple and usual ones like database extracts, documentary analysis, interviews or field visits, to more technical ones like focus groups, or cost benefit analysis. The proposed methodology aims for an appropriate mix of tools that strengthens the evidence basis of the evaluation and the credibility of its conclusions, given the time frame by the ToR.

**Survey**

A survey is an observation tool which quantifies and compares information. Data are collected from a sample of the population targeted by the evaluation. A survey questionnaire is a schedule of questions collecting information needed for the evaluation. Respondents are not supposed to answer the essential issue under investigation: in a good questionnaire, questions derive from the evaluation questions and are sufficiently basic for the respondent to answer them.

Questionnaires often combine both types, with a preference for structured items and a few open-ended questions (yielding information which is more diverse and/or precise, but less amenable to statistical analysis).

For this evaluation there are internet tools like Survey Monkey that could be used with different actors (with Internet access) in all the focused countries.

**Structured questionnaires**

Structured items are questions which respondents must answer in a specific way by choosing from a limited and predetermined set of answers. The questionnaire format is designed to obtain information about facts, to find out whether respondents agree to a suggestion, to record their opinions on a set of assertions, etc.

**Open-ended questionnaires**

In open-ended questionnaires, respondents answer a precise question and interviewers take notes. Thus, open-ended questionnaires are similar to structured interviews, as open-ended items allow a variety of approaches and depth in response.

Structured questionnaires have the advantage of allowing a cost-effective statistical analysis. Yet, they can be unforgiving during times when the evaluator needs to refine some questions. Through a daily check with the interviewers, the evaluator can decide to develop or add questions during the interviews, with a view to undertake a more precise analysis.

**Interview**

The interview is an information collection tool which usually takes the shape of a face-to-face discussion between the evaluator and the interviewee. In evaluation, the use of interviews is simple, quick, and affordable, which makes its use inevitable.

In evaluation, the interview collects different kind of information:

• Facts and information for the verification of facts

• Opinions and perspectives

• Analyses

• Suggestions

• Reactions to the evaluator's hypotheses and conclusions

The interview may be used as a quantitative collection tool; however, it is mostly a qualitative device. Information, including facts that can be checked, points of view, analyses and opinions should be clearly distinguished. Three types of interviews can be carried out:

**Unstructured interviews**

The interviewee expresses himself/herself freely and can discuss unplanned topics, because there is no predetermined set of questions. The evaluator intervenes only to generate and develop questions relating to the interviewee's comments.

**Semi-structured interviews**

This type of interviews collects the respondents' testimonies using an interview guideline (flexible framework of topics derived from the evaluation questions). The evaluator modifies the interview guide's instructions with additional questions, in order to develop useful areas of inquiry during the interview.

This type of interview is the most frequently used, particularly when the evaluator knows sufficient about the aims and the main questions to pose during the evaluation.

**Structured interviews**

The evaluator follows strictly the interview guideline instructions. He/She asks different interviewees the same set of questions and the interviewee is not given the opportunity to express himself/herself freely. The evaluator avoids generating and developing additional questions. Answers to each question tend to be short.

**Case study**

Case study reviews of one or more actual examples, can be carried out in order to gain an in-depth knowledge of the topic and, if possible, to learn about the framework programme and the entire initiative.

Case studies are the preferred evaluation tool when "how" and "why" questions are being posed, they allow a detailed examination of the actual elements in line with the evaluation goals. The purpose of the case study is to provide a picture, which is often more reliable than the outputs from other tools in context of the scarcity of basic data.

If case studies include the analysis of documents, statistical and implementing data, they are mostly known as a field observation tool and a means to interview people directly involved in the programme, such as the officials and stakeholders.

**Focus group**

A focus group is a form of group interviewing which comprises individuals involved in a development policy or intervention. It is set up to get information concerning the people's opinions, behaviours, or to explain their expectations from the said policy or intervention. In that sense, a focus group is a fast result-driven qualitative survey.

The focus group is useful in evaluations of projects or programmes, and particularly for field studies with beneficiaries and intermediary stakeholders. When a focus group is organised after the implementation of a programme with a view to assess its impact, it helps understanding, analysing and identifying the reasons beneath the opinions expressed by the participants.

The focus group is a mean to collect information and points of view quickly. When it involves stakeholders with different points of views, it eases the expression and explanation of the discrepancies within those points of view, as well as enabling an in-depth study of the stakeholders' opinions. They could be useful to gather information at the local but mostly at the national level on the ART initiative.

**SWOT (Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats)**

SWOT analysis (Strengths - Weaknesses - Opportunities - Threats) is a strategy analysis tool. It combines the study of the strengths and weaknesses of an organization, a geographical area, or a sector, with the study of the opportunities and threats to their environment. As such, it is instrumental in development strategy formulation.

The aim of the analysis is to take into account internal and external factors, maximizing the potential of strengths and opportunities, while minimizing the impact of weaknesses and threats.

SWOT analysis is usually prepared through meetings with the stakeholders or experts concerned with the strategy. It can be used to identify possible strategic approaches. Although originally designed for planning, this tool is used in evaluation to ensure that the implemented strategy is appropriate to the situation described in the analysis. Thus, it may either be used for intermediary evaluations, in order to check the relevance of the interventions under evaluation, and if required, their coherence.

## 5. Online survey questions (suggested)

1. The organization you work for is: UN agency, international aid other than UN, government, civil society
2. The UNDP allowed the participation from different actors or stakeholders? In your opinion the Subregional programme (specific project) is: very participative, participative, non-participative, non-participative at all.
3. The communication between the stakeholders and UNDP was satisfactory?
4. In your own words, what was the added value from the UNDP?
5. Were the outputs produced by the project of high quality and effective? (agree or disagree)
6. Are the products delivered by the project adapted to country needs? How?
7. Have the products/services delivered been successfully used, expanded or replicated by the beneficiary (since project completion)?
8. Name the main good practices or success stories from the program (please describe). Were these experiences shared with other countries?
9. The UNDP transferred technical capacities to partners at the subregional and national levels?
10. In your opinion:
    * what were the three main Program strengths
    * What were the three main Program flaws or short-comings?
11. What suggestions/recommendations would you make to UNDP for greater effectiveness/impact

## 6. Structure of evaluation report

The evaluation report will consist of four Chapters and a maximum of 30-40 pages. It will have the following format.

**Executive Summary**

**Chapter 1: Introduction** - (Background and approach/methodology, Evaluation Scope and

Objectives, Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Approach and Methods)

**Chapter 2: The Development Challenge**

**Chapter 3: UNDP Response and Challenges**

**Chapter 4: Evaluation findings (Contribution to Results) including** in-depth analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes and development results based on the following criteria

4.1 Relevance

4.2 Effectiveness

4.3 Efficiency

4.4 Sustainability

**Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations**

* 1. Conclusions
  2. Recommendations

**Chapter 6: Lessons learned and best practices identified**

**Annexes: list of people consulted, documents reviewed, field visit agenda**

## 7. Reference documents

The list of document to be consulted includes but is not necessarily limited to the following:

National Development Plans - national priorities from Barbados and SIDS United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012 to 2016

Subregional Programme Document for Barbados and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (2012 to 2016)

Multi-Country Programme Action Plan between the Governments of Barbados and the

OECS & UNDP (2012 to 2016)

The 2014 to 2017 UNDP Strategic Plan

The 2014 to 2017 UNDP Gender Strategy

The 2014 to 2017 UNDP Youth Strategy

Results Oriented Annual Report (2011, 2012, 2013)

The Project Documents, Project AWPs and quarterly and annual reports of the projects

Key products produced or supported by the outcome interventions

Project Evaluation Reports

UNDP Evaluation Report Template

UN Evaluation Norms and Standards

UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Results

## 8. Project List

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Climate Change and Disaster Risk Resilience** | | |
| 00085959 | Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation & Nuclear Safety (BMU) Programme on integrated Adaptation Strategies in Grenada UNDP/GIZ | **3,259,167** |
| 00086915 | DIPECHO-Community Alert Integrated (DIM EXP DEC 2014) | **655,320** |
| 00087426 | Strengthening Capacity in Post Disaster Needs Assessment UNISDR | **441,750** |
| 00087427 | Strengthening Public Investment in DRR & Climate Change UNISDR | **779,420** |
| 00087550 | Strengthening DRR in St. Vincent & the Grenadines | **50,000** |
| 00088792 | Eastern Caribbean Recovery (DIM EXP DEC 2014) | **120,000** |
| 00089776 | Caribbean Tsunami Information Center UNESCO | **626,400** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Energy and Environment** | | |
| 00087071 | AUS-SIDS climate Change Negotiations | **739,626.87** |
| 00085597 | Conserving Biodiversity & Reducing Habitat Degradation-St Kitts | **64,000** |
| 00085646 | Grenada Ridge to Reef IP | **100,000** |
| 00086194 | Promoting Access to Clean Energy-St Vincent IP | **92,890** |
| 00087225 | Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Public Buildings IP | **100,000** |
| 00087492 | Preparation for 2014 SIDS Conference | **65,000** |
| 00090390 | Caribbean Community Lighting Project | **1,070,000** |
| 00091426 | National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Antigua and Barbuda | **136,000** |
| 00087221 | Green City: Promoting small island integrated urban development in Portsmouth DMI | **100,000** |
| 00087223 | Low Carbon Development Path: Supporting the Sustainability and maintenance of Ecosystem Integrity, health and Function DMI | **100,000** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sustainable Human Development and Inclusive Governance** | | |
| 00064116 | Youth Innovation Caribbean Network for Youth (DIM EXP DEC 2014) | **3,576,983** |
| 00075559 | Caribbean Human Development Report Citizen Security | **183,344** |
| 00082501 | Engaging Caribbean Youth on Citizen Security (DIM EXP DEC 2014) | **175,000** |
| 00045318 | Strengthening Poverty and Social Sector Development in the OECS | **100,000** |
| 00085797 | A Future for SIDS: St. Lucia Post 2015 | **50,000/10,000/25,000** |
| 00086185 | Strengthening Capacity to Monitor Human Development | **50,000** |
| 00086740 | Poverty Reduction& Empowerment for Sustainable Livelihoods-Dominica | **50,000** |
|  | MDG Acceleration in Grenada-SEED | **50,000** |
|  | Supporting Multidimensional Poverty Measurement and Strengthening Capacity of Statistical Office-Antigua | **23,000** |
|  | Supporting Multidimensional Poverty Measurement and Strengthening Capacity of Statistical Office-St. Lucia | **46,000** |
|  | The MDG Assessment Framework for Barbados | **45,000** |
|  | Supporting Multi-dimensional Approaches to Poverty Eradication in Anguilla, Montserrat and the British Virgin Islands | **500,000** |
|  | Regional Strategy on Statistics for the OECS | **400,000** |

1. Revised Treaty of Basseterre establishing the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States Economic Union [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. UNDP (2011). Sub Regional Situational Analysis of the Development Context of Barbados and the OECS [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Mc Donald Thomas and Eleanor Wint, (2002): Inequality and Poverty in the Eastern Caribbean. Caribbean Development Bank [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *ibid.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (2008). *Exploring Policy Linkages between Poverty, Crime and Violence: A look at Three Caribbean States*. <http://www.eclac.cl/publicaciones/xml/2/33252/L.172.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (2013). Caribbean Forum: Shaping a sustainable development agenda to address the Caribbean Reality in the twenty first century. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP (2011). Sub Regional Situational Analysis of the Development Context of Barbados and the OECS [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Sub-regional Programme Document for Barbados and the OECS (2012-2016) – Results Framework [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Non-project activities is a term for those actions that are not formally programmed or budgeted, that are developed on a daily basis such as advocacy, brokering between governments and donors, resource mobilization, unforeseen technical assistance, meetings, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Taken from ToR: Mid Term Evaluation of Sub regional Programme 2012-2016 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Weiss, C. Theory based evaluation: theories of change for poverty reduction programs. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. To evaluate the SR Program, the TOR lists a set of questions that the evaluation will address [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. In collaboration with the UNDP Sub Regional Office [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The information matrix is useful to finalize the overall evaluation method in a way which cuts across the evaluation questions and which makes a good enough mix of evaluation tools, considering the available time and resources. The method draws up the list of all evaluation tools suggested in the tables. Each tool is then considered from the viewpoint of its capacity to help answering several questions and sub-questions. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. To be agreed with the CO according to the selection criteria provided above [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
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17. From the ToR [↑](#footnote-ref-17)