

# Annex I: Final Evaluation Terms of Reference

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP project titled “Strengthening Evidence Based Decision Making for Citizen Security in the Caribbean (CariSECURE)”, which is to be undertaken between July 2022 and August 2022. The project started on 25 July 2016 and is in its final year of implementation). This ToR sets out the expectations for this Final Evaluation. The evaluation process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *UNDP Evaluation Guidelines* (revised in June 2021) ([UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.pdf](#))

## 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

CariSECURE 1.0 is a Key Activity under the USAID’s larger Youth Empowerment Services (YES) Project executed across 8 countries, namely: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname. The project is being implemented by the UNDP Barbados Multi-country Office in cooperation with the UNDP Offices in Guyana and Suriname and with specific oversight from the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC) due to the regional scope of the project (Eastern and Southern Caribbean).

At the national level, the project engaged partners and stakeholders to include: National Security Ministries, police forces, statistical offices, probation and parole services, public prosecution offices, courts, prisons, Ministries of Youth. CARISECURE worked with regional institutions such as the Regional Security System (RSS) and supported the establishment of a regional crime observatory at the organisation to collect and aggregate national data on the citizen security indicators from their member states on a monthly basis and generate regional analysis to feed into their semi-annual meeting of the Council of Ministers of National Security. The Project also engaged with CARICOM IMPACS to expand such analysis to CARICOM Member States, through the establishment of a crime and violence data warehouse which hosts the Police Records Management Information System (PRMIS) application and will support the RSS with the collection, monitoring and analysis of these regional indicators to support evidence-based decision-making on crime and violence within Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean.

CariSECURE also collaborated with UNWOMEN and the IDB Citizen Security Programme in Guyana to cost share and pilot the recently approved CARICOM GBV Prevalence Survey Model in order to test the validity of data received on incidences of sexual and domestic violence. Additionally, CariSECURE through an agreement with UNODC and the Saint Lucia Central Statistics Office supported the implementation of the 2020 National Crime Victimization Survey in Saint Lucia. The Project has also collaborated with the Office of the Attorney General in Barbados to support activities in Barbados to combat trafficking in persons including: training for officers of the Barbados Police Service on the detection, investigation and prosecution of trafficking in persons; a TIP knowledge and perception survey of the Barbadian public and public awareness products – jingle, PSAs and video targeted at the Barbadian Public.

The purpose of the YES Project is to increase the institutional and technical capacity of regional bodies,

selected national government systems and community stakeholders to reduce risk factors that drive youth crime, violence, and victimization. It has a specific goal of reducing youth involvement in crime and violence in target communities. Accordingly, the YES Project has three expected results under its relevant Activities:

- **CariSECURE Project** - Strengthened Evidence-based Decision-making in Youth Crime and Violence Prevention Policy and Programming
- **Community, Family and Youth Resilience (CFYR) Project** - Communities, families, and youth strengthened to withstand, mitigate and recover from crime and violence and the
- **Juvenile Justice Reform Project (JJRP)** – The rehabilitation and reintegration of youth in conflict with the law in society

The Strategic Objective of CariSECURE was to ensure Regional, national and local organizations use evidence-based decision making for youth crime and violence prevention and policymaking with associated outputs as follows:

- Output I: Standardized and Disaggregated Crime Data Reporting Within and among National Authorities to foster the reliance on valid, reliable, and comparable data on Citizen Security
- Output II: Utilization of evidence-based analysis on crime data to inform citizen security strategies, programs and policies
- Output III: Improved decision-making on youth crime and violence based on available evidence at the national level

Further project details are provided in the Table below:

Table 1: Project Information

Project title:	Strengthening Evidence Based Decision Making for Citizen Security in the Caribbean (CariSECURE)		
ATLAS ID:	00097340		
Corporate outcome and output	UNDP strategic Plan Outcome 3: Responsive, inclusive and accountable institutions improve the quality of democracy and the rule of law		
Country	Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname		
Region	Eastern and Southern Caribbean		
Date project document signed	25 July 2016		
Project dates	Project start: 25 July 2016	Start	Planned end
	Project Revisions: (please see table below) New end date: 31 October 2022	25 July 2016	31 October 2022
Project budget	10,683,143.72		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation			

Funding Source	United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Rule of Law, UK-FCDO, UNDP TRAC Funds
----------------	---

Detailed Project Revisions undertaken:

Revision	Scope	Beneficiary Countries	Results Framework	Closure of Project
November 2018	National beneficiaries adjusted from 5 to 3 in each country (Police, Prisons, Prosecutions)	Reduced from 10 to 8 (Trinidad and Tobago and Dominica removed)	Outputs and Indicators revised 30 September 2020	30 September 2020
August 2020	National beneficiaries adjusted from 3 to 1 in each country (Police)	Number remains at 8	Indicators revised, some removed and more added	30 September 2021
September 2021	Local installation of PRMIS pilot in Grenada; monitoring and provision of technical support with PRMIS implementation; Inclusion of activities related to Trafficking in Persons (TIP)	Number remains at 8	Indicators for TIP revised	30 April 2022
March 2022	Support the full operationalization of the Crime Data Warehouse Solution by building the capacity of CARICOM IMPACS; ongoing technical and capacity-building support to countries to build crime analysis capacity; and addressing national level ICT and other gaps identified in roadmap and sustainability documents to support full	Number remains at 8	Indicators have not been revised as the work foreseen will involve reinforcement of capacities in identified indicators	31 October 2022

	deployment of PRMIS			
--	---------------------	--	--	--

### 3. FINAL EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The Final evaluation report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, future projects with similar objectives, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The Final evaluation report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments and is one of the evaluations to be implemented under the UNDP 2022 to 2026 evaluation plan within outcome 4 of the Country Programme document and Outcome 1 of the UNDP 2022-2025 Strategic Plan.

The final evaluation will also be important in determining the completeness of the project, and if the activities and indicators identified during project development justly reflected the project objectives. It could also provide some guidance on how request for project extensions could be fairly correlated to time granted.

The evaluation will be focused on the 8 beneficiary countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Suriname. Particular attention will be placed on the Tier 1 countries (Barbados, Grenada and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines), that have been prioritized and have benefited from a greater level of support through the project. It will assess the project's impact on the availability of crime and violence data, the analysis of this data, frameworks for sharing data with key stakeholders and agencies and the use of available data in the development of strategies and policies. The evaluation will target key national agencies that have benefitted from the project, namely national police forces/services (including crime analysis units where applicable), Ministries of National Security, statistical bureaux, Ministries of Youth/Youth affairs and other agencies engaged in the CariSECURE National Task Forces. Additionally, the Office of the Attorney General and the National Task Force for the prevention of Trafficking in Persons in Barbados should be targeted for activities related in Trafficking in Persons (TIP) in that country.

The evaluation will also concentrate on the following outcomes and outputs:

#### **Output I: Standardized and Disaggregated Crime Data Reporting Within and among National Authorities to foster the reliance on valid, reliable, and comparable data on Citizen Security**

1.1 Number of countries with government approved Caribbean Security Toolkit

1.2 Number of countries with draft Correspondence Tables for International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS)

1.3 Number of Countries with Digitized Applications for Police as a result of CariSECURE's assistance

1.4 Number of Tier I countries with 75% of Police stations with digitized Police application capable of collecting and producing crime statistics report

1.5 Number of Tier I countries with 75% of Police stations utilizing mobile technology

**Output II: Utilization of evidence-based analysis on crime data to inform citizen security strategies, programs and policies**

2.1 A regional crime observatory with the capacity to analyze security data received from countries

2.2 Number of countries capable of producing analysis using the Citizen Security Indicators

2.3 Number of Countries with the Police force having Crime Analysis Units with the capability of generating intelligence reports

**Output III: Improved decision-making on youth crime and violence based on available evidence at the national level**

3.1: Number of Countries with developed response strategies and tactical responses to crime and violence due to information sharing between the Police and relevant agencies and the coordinated support of CariSECURE

3.2 Number of countries utilizing non-administrative or survey data with the help of CariSECURE to inform national crime and violence strategies with Youth and Gender considerations

3.3 Number of Police Officers with basic TIP skills and training to respond to Trafficking in Persons

3.4 Number of Police Officers with enhanced specialized TIP skills and training to respond to Trafficking in Persons

3.5 National Survey completed on public knowledge and perception of TIP

## **4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GUIDING QUESTIONS**

The project will be evaluated within key criteria to determine if the project meets required standards and will be assessed through the use of key evaluation questions. Evaluation questions outline the information that the evaluation will generate. It is proposed that these questions, once answered, will provide users of the evaluation with the information they require to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. Questions should be grouped according to the four Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) coherence c) effectiveness; (d) efficiency; and (e) sustainability. Cross-cutting issues e) Human rights and f) Gender equality should also be assessed. While sample questions have been provided in Annex B, it is expected that the final questions used in the evaluation will be submitted by the consultant in the Inception report.

## 5. FINAL EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The final evaluation report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The Evaluator will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e., Project Document, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) project reports including annual APRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation.

The Evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to organizations and persons listed in Annex I; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the Evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to consult with local project teams and the key stakeholders in one country from each Tier as follows (final country selections to be confirmed):

- Tier 1 countries – Barbados, Grenada and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines;
- Tier 2 counties - Antigua and Barbuda, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis or Saint Lucia
- Tier 3 country - Suriname.

The UNDP suggests that the following methodological approaches be utilized:

- a) Document review of all relevant documentation
- b) Semi-structured interviews (this will also inform the development and finalization of key evaluation questions)
- c) Data review and analysis
- d) Field visits to aforementioned countries

However, it is noted that the specific design and methodology for the evaluation should emerge from consultations between the evaluator, programme unit and key stakeholders regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the final evaluation purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The evaluator must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, support to persons with disabilities, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the Final Evaluation Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE Team.

## 6. EVALUATION REFERENCE GROUP (ERG)

Based on the perceived scope of the evaluation, an evaluation reference group will be utilized to support the evaluation process, help to ensure transparency, provide comments and directions as well as to strengthen the credibility of the evaluation. The evaluation reference group will consist of key government partners, project management boards and individuals with expertise in evaluation design, conduct and quality. The ERG will also review key deliverables produced throughout the evaluation, including the Inception Report, Draft and Final Evaluation reports.

## 7. ACTIVITIES AND TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the Final Evaluation will be approximately 45 days over a time period of 10 weeks starting from the date of contract signature and shall not exceed 5 months from when the consultants are hired. The tentative Final Evaluation timeframe is as follows; however completion dates are tentative and may be adjusted based on when the contract is signed:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing Final Evaluation Inception Report (Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the Final Evaluation mission)	5 days	August 16, 2022
Final Evaluation mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits  <i>NB: The mission is tentative and will depend on the sanitary restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. If it cannot be completed on-site, interviews will be carried out virtually. The stakeholder interviews, if done virtually, may require a longer than usual time period. Please adjust the number of days and completion date to accommodate this.</i>	17 days	September 14, 2022
Presentation of initial findings	2 days	September 16, 2022

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Preparing draft report	5 days	September 23, 2022
Finalization of evaluation report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP, ERG and stakeholder comments on the draft and 2 weeks after stakeholder feedback received) <i>(note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)</i>	3 days	October 19, 2022

N.B: Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

## 8. FINAL EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>Inception Report (no less than 15 pages)</b>	Evaluator clarifies objectives and methods of Final evaluation exercise	No later than 1 week before the Final Evaluation mission:	Evaluator submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission:	Evaluator presents to project management, the Implementing Partners and the Commissioning Unit
3	<b>Draft Final Report (40-60 pages including the Executive summary)</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission:	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by, Project Coordinating Unit, ERG
4	<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft:	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

\*The final evaluation report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

## 9. FINAL EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS



The principal responsibility for managing this Final Evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean Sub-Regional Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the countries selected (to be confirmed) for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 10. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR

The independent evaluator (with experience and exposure to similar projects and evaluations in other regions) will conduct the Final Evaluation. The evaluator will conduct interviews with local counterparts, conduct site visits, liaise with local counterparts to schedule meetings and visits (with some support from UNDP), be responsible for the overall design and writing of key reports and supporting documents (Inception and Final Evaluation report), analyze and interpret data collected, present findings, deduce key lessons, insights and recommendations and ensure these are reflected in the relevant reports.

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Technical Criteria	Rating
Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies and applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios <i>Less than 1 year – 5pts</i> <i>1 -3 Years -15pts</i> <i>3 years and over 20 pts</i>	20
Experience working with citizen security projects, demonstrated understanding of issues in citizen security and competence in adaptive management, as applied to citizen security <i>Less than 1 year – 5pts</i> <i>1 -3 Years -15pts</i> <i>3 years and over 20 pts</i>	20
Experience with national, multi-sectoral stakeholder engagement in the OECS	10
Project evaluation/review experience within UN system	10

A Master's degree in criminology, criminal justice, public policy, monitoring and evaluation or other closely related field	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70</b>

#### Education

- A Master's degree in criminology, criminal justice, public policy, monitoring and evaluation or other closely related field
- Certification in project management is an asset.

#### Experience

- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to citizen security
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in the Eastern and Southern Caribbean, in particular Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname.
- Experience in relevant technical areas;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, youth crime and violence and citizen security. Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

#### Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

## **11.ETHICS**

The Final Evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The Final Evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the Final Evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the final evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## **12.PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the Evaluation Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
  - 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the Draft Evaluation report to the Commissioning Unit
  - 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the Final Evaluation report and approval by the Commissioning Unit (via Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed Audit Trail
- Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%<sup>1</sup>:
- The Final Evaluation report includes all requirements outlined in the evaluation TOR and is in accordance with the evaluation guidance.
  - The Final Evaluation report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e., text has not been cut & pasted from other evaluation reports).
  - The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

### 13.APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>2</sup>

#### Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>3</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV or a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>4</sup>);
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by email indicating the following reference “Consultant for Final Evaluation for “Strengthening Evidence Based Decision Making for Citizen Security in the Caribbean (CariSECURE)” at the following address ONLY: [procurement.bb@undp.org](mailto:procurement.bb@undp.org) by the indicated deadline.

<sup>1</sup> The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

[https://popp.undp.org/\\_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP\\_POPP\\_DOCUMENT\\_LIBRARY/Public/PSU\\_Individual%20Contract\\_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default)

<sup>2</sup> Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

<sup>3</sup>

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psu/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

**ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Evaluation Team**

1. UNDP Project Document
2. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
3. Project Inception Report
4. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
5. Audit reports
6. Updates results framework showing target achievement to date by indicator
7. Oversight mission reports
8. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
9. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
10. Workplans and Procurement Plans
11. Project Risk log

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals, and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and the Project Appraisal Committee Meeting
15. Project site location maps
16. Key Stakeholders and Partners

## ToR ANNEX B: Final Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance/Coherence</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between the project and key country priorities and planning documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>National policies and strategic plans</li> <li>Annual and Semi-Annual Reports</li> <li>International SDG documentation</li> <li>Information collected through interviews and desk review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents, Interviews with stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alignment of project to theory of change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>UNDP Barbados Country Programme Document (CPD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of gender mainstreaming and empowerment throughout project implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Information collected through interviews and desk review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents, Interviews with stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adaptation of lessons learned from similar interventions in the project document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Information collected through interviews and desk review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents, Interviews with stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of perspectives and evidence of their integration in finalised project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Information collected through interviews and desk review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents, Minutes of Project Board meetings and stakeholder consultations, interviews with key stakeholders</li> </ul>

	account during the project design processes?			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Congruence between the projects results framework and development challenges identified in National planning documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>National policies and strategic plans</li> <li>Annual and Semi-Annual Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have there been synergies and interlinkages between the project and other interventions carried out by the government?</li> <li>Is the project in alignment with other interventions in the same context (i.e. complementarity, harmonisation and coordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of internal coherence</li> <li>Evidence of external coherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>National policies and strategic plans</li> <li>Annual and Semi-Annual Reports</li> <li>Information collected through interviews and desk review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents, Interviews with stakeholders, site visits</li> </ul>

**Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent has progress been made towards the programme goals, including gender equality, women's empowerment, and other cross-cutting issues?</li> <li>What key results and changes have been attained for men, women and vulnerable groups?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target achievement for relevant indicators</li> <li>Beneficiary testimony confirming improvement in system management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (APR)</li> <li>Monitoring Reports</li> <li>Beneficiary testimony</li> <li>Site visit/field reports</li> <li>Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Site visits</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--

**Efficiency**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the country programme delivered, or is likely to deliver, its interventions and results in an economic and timely manner?</li> <li>• To what extent were resources (funds, expertise, time) sufficient?</li> <li>• To what extent were the resources used to address inequalities in general, and gender issues in particular?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost efficient and timely delivery</li> <li>• Alignment of expenditure with outcome specific to gender and cross-cutting issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Work Plans</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (APR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> <li>• Revised Project Results Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the programme benefits for women, men and other vulnerable groups?</li> <li>• To what extent have partners committed to provide continuing support (financial, female and male staff etc.) to sustain the programme results?</li> </ul>	Approved and validated Sustainability plan in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (APR)</li> <li>• Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> <li>• Sustainability Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Site visits</li> </ul>
• Cross cutting issues		•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme design?</li> </ul>	Evidence of consultation and involvement	Project planning documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of documents</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme implementation?</li> </ul>	Evidence of consultation and involvement	Project planning documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of documents</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

## ToR ANNEX C: Evaluation Criteria and Ratings

<b>RELEVANCE:</b>	<b>Is the Intervention doing the right things?</b> The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to global and national needs, policies and priorities and those of beneficiaries and partner institutions, and continue to do so as circumstances change.
<b>COHERENCE:</b>	<b>How well does the intervention fit?</b> The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.
<b>EFFECTIVENESS:</b>	<b>Is the intervention achieving its objectives?</b> The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.
<b>EFFICIENCY:</b>	<b>How well are resources being used?</b> The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.
<b>SUSTAINABILITY:</b>	<b>Will the benefits last?</b> The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

Ratings for Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness and Efficiency		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained



#### TOR Annex D: Recommendations Table template:

Rec #	TE Recommendation	Entity Responsible	Time frame
A	Category 1:		
A.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
A.2			
A.3			
B	Category 2:		
B.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
B.2			
B.3			
C	Category 3:		
C.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
C.2			
C.3			
D	Category 4:		
D.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
D.2			
D.3			
E	Category 5:		
E.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
E.2			

#### ToR ANNEX E: Audit Trail Template

*Note:* The following is a template for the Evaluator to show how he/she received comments on the draft evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final evaluation report.

#### To the comments received on **(date)** from the Final Evaluation of **(project name)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken

## TOR Annex F: Code of Conduct

### Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_