



JOINT SDG FUND

# **Final Evaluation of Joint Programme 'Enhancing Resilience and Acceleration of the SDGs in the Eastern Caribbean' from 2020 to 2022**

Evaluation Terms of Reference

Commissioned by WFP, ILO, UNDP, UNICEF, UN WOMEN

November 2021

# Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. Background</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1. Introduction  | 1         |
| 1.2. Context   | 1         |
| <b>2. Reasons for the evaluation</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| 2.1. Rationale   | 5         |
| 2.2. Objectives  | 5         |
| 2.3. Stakeholder Analysis  | 6         |
| <b>3. Subject of the evaluation</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| 3.1. Subject of the Evaluation   | 6         |
| 3.2. Scope of the Evaluation   | 11        |
| <b>4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations</b>        | <b>12</b> |
| 4.1. Evaluation Questions and Criteria                                       | 12        |
| 4.2. Evaluation Approach and Methodology                                     | 14        |
| 4.3. Evaluability assessment   | 15        |
| 4.4. Ethical Considerations  | 16        |
| 4.5. Quality Assurance   | 16        |
| <b>5. Organization of the evaluation</b>                                     | <b>17</b> |
| 5.1. Phases and Deliverables   | 17        |
| 5.2. Evaluation Team Composition   | 18        |
| 5.3. Roles and Responsibilities  | 19        |
| 5.4. Security Considerations   | 20        |
| 5.5. Communication   | 20        |
| 5.6. Budget  | 21        |
| <b>Annexes</b>   | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Annex 1: Maps</b>   | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Annex 2: Timeline</b>   | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Annex 3: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Committee</b>             | <b>26</b> |
| <b>Annex 4: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Reference Group</b>       | <b>27</b> |
| <b>Annex 5: Communication and Knowledge Management Plan</b>                  | <b>29</b> |
| <b>Annex 6: Bibliography</b>   | <b>33</b> |
| <b>Annex 7: Acronyms</b>   | <b>34</b> |
| <b>Annex 8: Results Framework</b>  | <b>35</b> |
| <b>Annex 9: Theory of Change</b>   | <b>39</b> |
| <b>Annex 10: List of Related Initiatives</b>                                 | <b>40</b> |
| <b>Annex 11: Preliminary Stakeholder Analysis</b>                            | <b>46</b> |
| <b>Annex 12: Guiding questions on inclusion of persons with disabilities</b> | <b>49</b> |

# 1. Background

1. These terms of reference (ToR) were prepared by the WFP Caribbean Office jointly with UNICEF, ILO, UNDP and UN WOMEN that are implementing partners of the joint programme *'Enhancing Resilience and Acceleration of the SDGs in the Eastern Caribbean: Universal adaptive social protection modelled at the community, national and sub-regional levels.'* The document is based upon an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders and following a standard WFP template whose evaluation system and procedures will be used for the purpose of this evaluation. The aim of these ToR is to provide key information to stakeholders about the evaluation, to guide the evaluation team and to specify expectations during the various phases of the evaluation.

## 1.1. INTRODUCTION

2. These ToR are for the **Final Joint Evaluation of Joint Programme 'Enhancing Resilience and Acceleration of the SDGs in the Eastern Caribbean'**. This evaluation is commissioned by WFP Caribbean Office jointly with UNICEF, ILO, UNDP and UN WOMEN and will cover its entire implementation period from **January 2020 to January 2022**.

3. The Joint Programme (JP) contributes to the development of an **adaptive and universal social protection system in Saint Lucia and Barbados** through integrated policy development, programme design and service implementation. The Joint Programme takes an innovative approach to modelling and piloting at community, national and sub-regional levels, which complements national plans and leverages resources from existing policy loans from international financial institutions. The programme utilizes research, analysis, monitoring and evaluation to support the evidence-based development of an adaptive system towards progressive universal coverage of social protection, while facilitating replication and expansion to Eastern Caribbean Countries (ECC) through South-South exchange under the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) framework. This also includes strengthening the OECS Commission to support scale-up and sustainability of interventions and implementation across the ECC.

4. The JP identified the **people living in poverty and being vulnerable to the impacts of climate change** as the **key target group** with particular attention being paid to the needs of women, children, and older persons directly, as well as youth, persons with disabilities and migrants indirectly where their needs are specific and in the event of shocks will be further left behind.

5. The SDG Fund requested the partners to commission a **final, independent and gender-responsive evaluation to assess the accomplishment of its main expected results**, contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document, as well as its contribution to SDG acceleration and United Nations (UN) Reform efforts. In addition to the request of the SDG Fund, the partner agencies will take the opportunity of this evaluation to assess **the value added of the partnership and take stock of lessons learnt and good practice** in view of future collaboration.

## 1.2. CONTEXT

6. Eastern Caribbean countries are highly vulnerable to shocks, including **economic crises, climate-related/natural hazards as well as displacement**. The Caribbean is the most indebted region in the world, limiting fiscal space. Disasters represent an estimated \$3 billion in annual losses regionally, hampering the capacity of governments to protect populations from covariate shocks. In the last four decades, the Caribbean suffered over USD 22 billion in damages as a direct result of disasters. Climate-related events are increasing both in severity and in frequency, which has risen by 347% between 1950 and 2016.

7. The JP aims to contribute to the acceleration of several Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and respective targets by building on specific interlinkages between them. While the main target to be addressed is **SDG 1.3 indicator to reduce poverty through nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all**, social protection is to be leveraged to also **promote and monitor equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex (SDG 5)** and **strengthen resilience** and capacity to cope with climate-related hazards and disasters (**SDG 13**).

8. The Eastern Caribbean suffers from **low economic growth with considerable poverty, under-employment, and social and gender inequalities**. One in four people (24%) lives in poverty<sup>1</sup>. The poverty rate is even higher among children compared to adults, with one in three children (33%) living in poverty and 4% in extreme poverty. Gender inequality is evidenced by **higher poverty levels amongst women-headed households with children** compared to households headed by men, pay gaps in the labour market and pervasive domestic violence. Social protection systems and a variety of social protection programmes exist in ECC, but these fall short in adequately meeting the needs of all people, especially the most vulnerable. Existing structures face fragmentation and would benefit from increased coverage, better coordination, strengthening delivery mechanisms and administration systems; revising and implementing legislative and policy frameworks; and maximizing and increasing fiscal space.

9. **Barbados's nominal GDP has risen over the past 20 years, from US\$ 3.054 billion in 2001 to 4.3 billion** in 2021 - a sharp drop from pre-COVID figures of 5.21 billion in 2019. Its population has also risen from 271,500 in 2000 to 287,400 in 2021. Similarly, life expectancy has risen from 77.1 years in 2000 to 79.2 years in 2021.<sup>2</sup> Women are currently expected to outlive their male counterparts, with 80 years, while men are expected to live to 78 years.<sup>3</sup> Despite these gains, it has experienced **low and negative real economic growth since the 2008** financial and economic crisis, considered the most severe and sustained global economic crisis in its history. This is reflected by large **fiscal deficits and an increasing public debt** - the highest in the region at 144.7% of GDP at the close of 2017<sup>4</sup>. While Barbados' dependence on imports exposes the country to external economic shocks, the government's policy response to shocks has contributed to this debt. In 2018, the Barbados Economic Recovery and Transformation (BERT) Programme was introduced to reduce expenditure, raise revenues and help the country to get out of its current situation. During this process, the aim of the government has been to protect the most vulnerable including women and girls

10. Notably, women are over-represented among the extremely poor, the poor and the vulnerable and thus were more vulnerable to the effects of crisis (including COVID-19). Moreover, women are five times as likely as men to be single parents living alone with their children.<sup>5</sup> They are also over-represented in extended families, which tend to be among the poorest in Barbados. Despite enjoying universal literacy and full primary school enrolment of boys and girls, this educational attainment does not translate into employment success. In Barbados, almost one in five employed persons live in poverty. Workers in the accommodation and food services sectors, mainly women, are particularly vulnerable. While women represent almost half the labour force, they are systematically paid less than men for occupations requiring the same skills, making them more vulnerable to crises and the COVID-19 economic shutdown.<sup>6</sup>

11. Additional natural hazards and climate-related shocks affect the country, including flooding, drought, tropical storm systems and occasional earthquakes. While not as hurricane-prone as other Caribbean states, its densely populated, low-lying coastal zone and tourism-based economy mean that hazards can threaten a large swathe of the country and its economy. For instance, COVID-19 restrictions have prompted an economic shutdown that most affected tourism and the informal sectors, where women are over-represented. Prior to the launch of the SDG Joint Fund, the Ministry of People Empowerment and Elder Affairs had explicitly requested the UN's support for an analysis of its social protection system for which a Core Diagnostic Instrument (CODI) had been offered as the mechanism of support.

12. The social protection system in Barbados includes social assistance to address poverty and social insurance schemes, such as unemployment insurance and pensions, but is fragmented. The number of household recipients of government assistance has significantly increased over the past few years from 5.5% of households in 2010 to 8.5% in 2016 receiving some form of assistance. The National Assistance Programme covers the largest number of people, around 3,942 households (in 2016, with spending of about \$3.6 million), with cash transfers, but also in-kind transfers (food, clothing, funeral costs etc.) to those in need with a focus on children, the unemployed, persons with disabilities, and the elderly. Other programmes are the

---

<sup>1</sup> UNICEF (2017), Child Poverty in the Eastern Caribbean

<sup>2</sup> World Bank Data Indicators, available at <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator>.

<sup>3</sup> Idem.

<sup>4</sup> IDB (2018), Report on Country Development Challenges

<sup>5</sup> Gender-responsive Assessment of Barbados' COVID-19 Social Protection Response, Francesca Francavilla, UNDP, February 2021.

<sup>6</sup> Idem.

“Identification, Stabilization, Enablement and Empowerment” Bridge programme with a duration of two years, which already ended, and several smaller programmes for specific groups, such as the Home Care Programme (daily activities for the elderly), the Poverty Eradication Fund for rent and utilities payments or the disaster relief plan managed by MPEA.<sup>7</sup>

13. Prior to the SDG JP, the need to strengthen governance in this sector was identified, as social programmes in Barbados are dispersed, resulting in both potential duplication and gaps. The system presents particular shortfalls in terms of addressing gender-related issues, such as domestic violence against women, and needs of persons with physical disabilities. However, Barbados has no gender policy nor national strategic action plan on gender-based violence.

14. In **Saint Lucia**, GDP has risen from \$933 million in 2000 to 1.703 billion in 2020, a sharp drop from pre-COVID figures of 2.122 billion in 2019. During this period the population has grown from 156,700 in 2000 to 183,600 in 2000. Life expectancy has risen from 73.3 years in 2000 to 76.2 years in 2019, with men expected to live to 75 years while women live to 78 years.<sup>8</sup> High educational attainment has not translated into employment. Despite having achieved universal primary education and secondary education and a literacy rate of at least 90 percent, the poverty levels have been on the rise since 2010, with slight decreases in extreme poverty, but increases of vulnerable people just above the poverty line.<sup>9</sup> One in four persons still lives in poverty.<sup>10</sup> Both poverty and vulnerability are gendered: 21% of women live in poverty compared to 14% of men, and 12.9% are vulnerable compared to 9.5% of men - and the trend is worsening.<sup>11</sup> About 57.1% of those households within the lowest consumption per capita quintile are likely to be headed by women. In addition, geographic disparities exist - from 2010 to 2016 the poverty rate in the Parish of Saint John increased from 8.33% to 23.90%, an increase of at least 5% also applies for parishes of Saint George and Saint Joseph.<sup>12</sup>

15. **Saint Lucia** has only recently shown signs of growth, grappling with substantial increases in unemployment between 2006 and 2016 as high as 25% at one stage, particularly among women and youth. This is despite the fact that women represent almost half of the labour force (48.5 percent).<sup>13</sup> In 2016 the female unemployment rate of 25.9 percent was more than double that of their male counterparts (11.3 percent). One in three youth (31.6 percent) were not in employment, education or training. In 2017 ILO found that one third of the adult workforce in St Lucia has been compelled to work in low-paid, low-productive informal sector.

16. Recommendations of the 2015 **Universal Periodic Review**<sup>14</sup> included to further **expand and develop Saint Lucia’s social programmes** with a special emphasis on the most disadvantaged persons, especially women and children, ensure that sustainable development is inclusive and equitable in the implementation of the National Social Protection Policy, and accelerate efforts aimed at reducing hunger by increasing access to affordable, nutritious, safe and quality food. While the country has also ratified Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, it has not developed a gender policy or a national strategic action plan on gender-based violence.

17. The country has a **range of social protection programmes**. The main **Public Assistance Programme (PAP)** under the Ministry of Equity covers about 2,446 households (2015) or 3356 people (2019) with cash transfers between ECD\$215-\$465 depending on household size. Other small-scale social programmes include the Child Disability Grant with 2019 coverage of 286 or the Koudmein Ste Lucie under the Saint Lucia Social Development Fund covering 100 beneficiaries of the PAP with additional support along seven pillars: personal identification, health, education, family dynamics, housing, employment and income. Saint Lucia reached a major milestone in February 2015 when it launched its **National Social Protection Policy** to strengthen its social protection system from a multidimensional approach. The policy objectives

---

<sup>7</sup> JP proposal

<sup>8</sup> World Bank Data Indicators, available at <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator>.

<sup>9</sup> Kairi Consultants for OECS Commission (2018), Saint Lucia National Report of Living Conditions 2016

<sup>10</sup> Idem

<sup>11</sup> Kairi Consultants for OECS Commission (2018), Saint Lucia National Report of Living Conditions 2016

<sup>12</sup> IDB (2018), Report on Country Development Challenges

<sup>13</sup> World Bank Indicators, available at <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.TLF.TOTL.FE.ZS?view=chart>.

<sup>14</sup> Human Rights Council (2015), Universal Periodic Review, Available online:

<https://www.refworld.org/topic,50ffbce51b1,50ffbce5208,5832fee74,0,,,LCA.html>

include the adoption of life-cycle, human development and rights-based approaches in addressing the needs of those living in poverty and vulnerable groups. Despite this progress, the policy was seen in need of an update to adequately reflect the importance of making the system adaptive to prepare for and respond to shocks including shock-responsive and climate change adaptation elements, as well as issues around migration/displacement and gender-responsiveness and working towards greater coherence and coverage. This also applied to a prepared Social Protection Bill. National priorities that the Joint Programme aims to support include an inter-institutional mechanism for policy implementation, the ongoing revision of disaster risk management legislation and a better understanding of data at the community level, including informal social protection, as well as better referral or integrated service delivery mechanisms.<sup>15</sup>

18. This Joint Programme saw particular **potential in accelerating progress towards the SDGs in supporting the government's goal to make the current social protection policy fit for shock response by linking it closely to disaster risk management and climate change adaptation efforts**, based on better availability and use of data at community and household level.

19. The **COVID-19 pandemic** resulted in major social and economic dislocation throughout the Caribbean. In **Barbados and Saint Lucia**, as across the region, **governments adopted a range of measures including the temporary expansion of key social protection programmes and creation of new programmes** to support the most vulnerable.

20. Like other islands in the Eastern Caribbean, Barbados and St Lucia have imposed varying COVID-19 travel restrictions and health measures including curfews, mandatory testing, quarantine upon arrival and more. Barbados currently has a curfew from 9:00 pm to 5:00 am Monday-Saturday and 6:00 pm to 5:00 am on Sunday and requires standard PCR tests for all incoming passengers. St Lucia extended its State of Emergency until October 16, 2021 and has limited social gatherings to ten immediate family members. Its curfew runs from 7:00pm to 4:00 am Monday through Friday, from 4:00pm on Saturday and all day on Sunday until Monday at 4:00am.

21. This paragraph summarises key related interventions of other actors in the two countries. The Interamerican Development Bank has given a US\$10 million loan for poverty alleviation in Barbados. The Caribbean Development Bank is financing 'Barbados Economic Recovery and Transformation Programme.' In Saint Lucia, international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the Caribbean Development Bank have been active in supporting social protection. The World Bank has loaned US\$20 million for the Saint Lucia Human Capital Resilience Project, which aims to strengthen the technical and vocational education and training in secondary and post-secondary schools and strengthening social protection service delivery. COVID-19 has altered the landscape by increasing UN engagement in the sub-region as the UN and governments provide support to persons directly impacted. Further, the UN has delivered strong development assistance to the strengthening of social protection including those agencies that partnered for the implementation of the JP.

22. As the JP embraces a range of approaches in support of strengthening of social protection towards universality and increasing adaptability in situations of crisis, there have been numerous strategic and resource partners that contribute to achieving the goals set out under the SDG Fund project. In this regard, WFP, UNICEF, UNDP, UN Women and ILO are directly implementing UN's support through the programme on social protection, building on their other programming in the sub-region. Other donors supporting complementary initiatives have included ECHO, FCDO, World Bank, Interamerican Development Bank, the UN-India Development Partnership Fund, administered through UNOSSC, and the Caribbean Development Bank.

---

<sup>15</sup> JP proposal

## 2. Reasons for the evaluation

### 2.1. RATIONALE

23. The evaluation is being commissioned for the following reasons:
- i. The SDG Fund requested the partners to commission a **final, independent and gender-responsive evaluation to assess the accomplishment of main expected results of the JP**, its contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document, as well as its contribution to **SDG acceleration and UN Reform efforts**.
  - ii. The partner agencies will take the opportunity of this evaluation to assess **the value added of the partnership and take stock of lessons learnt and good practice** in view of future collaboration and (post)-COVID response.
24. The evaluation is being commissioned and needed at this time as:
- i. The SDG Fund requires the evaluation to be finalized before the end date of the JP in May 2022, and the funds available for the evaluation need to be disbursed by that date.<sup>16</sup>
  - ii. At the same time, the evaluation is timely to inform the formulation and early implementation stage of further joint programmes in Eastern Caribbean (few are currently under development and expected to start in 2022).
  - iii. It will provide useful information on the COVID response efforts and contribute to 'post-COVID' programming plans, including through identification of remaining capacity gaps at national level.
25. The evaluation will be useful for the partnering UN agencies when designing future joint programmes through the identification of lessons learnt and a deeper understanding how joint programmes position agencies vis-à-vis the national governments. Also, it will be useful to inform PUNO's further efforts in the field of shock responsive social protection in the Eastern Caribbean and other similar contexts.

### 2.2. OBJECTIVES

26. This evaluation will serve the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning. The gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE), human rights and equity will be mainstreamed across both evaluation objectives. While requested by the donor on the ground of accountability, the PUNO's consider the evaluation critical to build evidence around joint programming and therefore there will be also a strong focus on learning.
27. The evaluation needs to also contribute to the new Multi-Country Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework cycle and explore how this first JP with a vertical fund strategically contributes to the cooperation framework and the roll out of the UN reform. In particular, the evaluation must draw lessons learned to inform joint UN Country programming such as the Country Implementation Plans and Joint Programmes in thematic priorities.
- **Accountability** – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the JP against the initial results matrix and its modifications resulting from the COVID-19 pandemics. It will, therefore, ensure that the Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development evaluation criteria of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability are adequately covered.
  - **Learning** – The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain results occurred or did not occur to draw lessons, derive good practice and provide pointers for learning. It will also provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making. Findings will be actively disseminated, and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson-sharing systems.

---

<sup>16</sup> The programme may be extended to May 2022 pending the SDG Secretariat's decision.



## 2.3. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

28. The evaluation will seek the views of, and be useful to, a broad range of internal (partnering UN agencies) and external stakeholders. A number of stakeholders will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process in light of their expected interest in the results of the evaluation and relative power to influence the results of the programme being evaluated.
29. Among primary users who are interested in learning from this evaluation are the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), PUNOs, as well as the Governments of St. Lucia and Barbados and the OECS. On the other hand, the Joint SDG Fund and the beneficiary have interest in the evaluation mainly for accountability.
30. Accountability to affected populations, is tied to UN commitments to include beneficiaries as key stakeholders in its work. The partnering UN Agencies are committed to ensuring gender equality, equity and inclusion in the evaluation process, with participation and consultation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups (including persons with disabilities, the elderly and persons with other diversities such as ethnic and linguistic).
31. Preliminary stakeholders identified include primary and secondary stakeholders. Among the primary stakeholders are internal stakeholders (RCO, PUNOs' multi-country offices in the Eastern Caribbean, PUNOs' Regional bureaux for Latin America and the Caribbean, PUNOs' Headquarters, PUNOs' Offices of Evaluation and PUNOs' governing bodies) and external stakeholders, such as beneficiaries, the Government of St Lucia, the Government of Barbados, and the United Nations Subregional Team, the SDG Fund, the World Bank, the OECS Commission, the Caribbean Development Bank and Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency. Annex 11 provides a preliminary stakeholder analysis, which should be deepened by the evaluation team as part of the inception phase.

# 3. Subject of the evaluation

## 3.1. SUBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

32. The JP was designed to contribute to the development of an adaptive and universal social protection system in **Saint Lucia and Barbados**, covering the entirety of the countries unless otherwise specified (see maps in Annex 1). Its initial duration is of two years (January 2020 until January 2022) with an extension until March 2022 to allow finalizing the evaluation.<sup>17</sup> The overall budget of the programme is USD \$ 4,804,402, with SDG Fund providing \$ 3 million and the rest being constituted by other funds of the five PUNOs. The JP has been co-led by UNICEF and WFP, while ILO, UNDP and UN Women are partnering for the implementation of the JP. The programme was approved in December 2019.

33. Through a **multi-country approach**, the JP is expected to enable partner governments to **accelerate progress towards the implementation of SDGs** in support of national commitments and reflective of the significant vulnerabilities of small island development states (SIDs) to external shocks, including climate-related events and impacts. Three key SDG targets are being addressed through JP interventions to increase the adaptability of social protection to prepare for and respond to shocks and stresses by strengthening its linkages to disaster risk management and climate change adaptation. Specifically, the Joint Programme is expected to contribute to strengthening institutional capacities to expand coverage and adequate social protection through vulnerability analysis and identification of at risk people on this basis, promoting a national social protection floor and sustainable and risk-informed financing (1.3); promoting and monitoring equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex (5.1) and increasing regional capacity to recognize unpaid care work (5.4); as well as improving service delivery to boost people's resilience and risk-management capacities (13.1) through evidence-generation and regional cooperation and knowledge sharing. At the end of the JP, the universal adaptive social protection model should be scalable to become an accepted framework for implementation in most, if not all 11 OECS countries and territories. Working with International Financial Institutions, namely Caribbean Development Bank and World Bank is key not only to ensure sustainable results in Saint Lucia and Barbados but also in replicating the model to

---

<sup>17</sup> The programme may be extended to May 2022 pending the SDG Secretariat's decision.



other countries. The **JP responds to specific national objectives and priorities of Saint Lucia and Barbados and links to regional and sub-regional frameworks** and mechanisms (OECS and CDEMA).

34. The **Theory of Change** of the Joint Programme has been initially summarized as follows (for more details see Annex 10):

The Joint Programme will contribute to creating an enabling environment for poor and vulnerable people to have predictable access to universal and adaptive social protection. This will support the ultimate goal of reducing structural inequality, reducing poverty and building resilience. Predictable access to universal and adaptive social protection will be promoted through an approach that spans and connects national, community and regional levels. At the national level, the JP will contribute to strengthening national social protection systems to support integrated service delivery by improving institutional capacities and through evidence-based, gender-responsive social and disaster risk management policies and legislation. It will also strengthen these systems through improved management and operational tools. The JP will support the introduction of innovative financing strategies to ensure fiscal sustainability and expanded coverage of the social protection system. At the community level, the JP will support the design of innovative community-based adaptive and shock responsive services within existing national programmes to generate evidence for social protection reform and strengthen the targeted communities' ability to anticipate, absorb and recover from major shocks. At the regional level, legal and policy coherence will be supported by strengthening regional capacities, inter-institutional engagement and South-South cooperation in the Eastern Caribbean.

35. The main assumptions underpinning the theory of change were described as follows:

- i. Governments and their partners show continued commitment at the national, community and regional level to strengthen capacities for a coherent and adaptive national system providing integrated social protection service delivery.
- ii. Fiscal policies and related reforms will keep budget deficits and debt levels to current or lower levels to allow for innovative financing strategies.
- iii. Space and platforms for evidence to inform decision-making exist, and they can be utilized as part of strengthening social protection reform and shock-responsive services.
- iv. Regional mechanisms and institutions can support regional policy coherence for social resilience in the OECS/Eastern Caribbean.
- v. Donors and development partners will support the programme and its integration and/or complementarity within existing and forthcoming social protection initiatives and investments.

36. The **goal of the JP** is the development of a customized and transformative model of universal adaptive social protection built on an expanded understanding of vulnerability in Saint Lucia, Barbados and across the OECS. The programme aims support national, sub-national and regional entities to ensure that social protection systems and programmes are more flexible, scalable, sustainable, gender-responsive and risk-informed through the below activities, which leverage the comparative advantages and mandates of PUNOs. These have been identified as the fundamental components to accelerate the implementation of the SDGs in the ECC, including on poverty, climate action, gender inequality, and food security.

37. The JP has one central **expected outcome**: Poor and vulnerable people have predictable access to adaptive universal social protection. Further, **five expected outputs** were identified as follows:

- i. Institutional capacities are strengthened for integrated service delivery through the development of evidence-based, gender-responsive social and DRM policy and legislation
- ii. Innovative financing strategies are introduced to ensure fiscal sustainability for minimum expanded coverage
- iii. Implementation of national social protection programmes is strengthened with improved management and operational tools
- iv. Targeted communities benefit from realignment of social protection programmes designed to strengthen their ability to anticipate, absorb and recover from climate-related shocks and stresses
- v. Regional capacities are strengthened for adaptive social protection by engaging stakeholders for policy coherence and South-South Cooperation

38. The **logic model** detailing the activities to be implemented under each one of the expected outputs and PUNOs responsible for implementation of the different activities is presented in Table 1. Further, the **results framework** that provides information on the JP indicators is presented in Annex 9. While a results

framework was included in the initial programme document, the indicator targets were initially missing and were only developed in December 2020 and May 2021.

39. The Joint Programme is carried out by 5 PUNOs, accountable for programme implementation and the achievement of results, while ensuring a cohesive UN approach to maximize synergies and results. As a multi-country office, the proposed interventions will require a comprehensive and integrated dimension to ensure acceleration of social protection linked to climate change and disaster risk management in Saint Lucia and Barbados. The number of PUNOs is based on required expertise and capacity to deliver the interlinked outputs at community, national and sub-regional levels. The co-lead agencies, WFP and UNICEF, have global expertise and staff in the Caribbean offices supporting governments in the development and strengthening of social protection systems, programmes and policies. In the Caribbean, WFP has expertise in disaster risk management and shock-responsive intervention, including cash-transfers, with social protection focus; while UNICEF brings its expertise on social protection policies and partnership with OECS. Both agencies are responsible for the Joint Programme strategic engagement and dialogue with countries and regional counterparts to ensure ownership, networking, technical approach, and the efficient use of resources for the day-to-day implementation of the programme. UNDP, UN Women and ILO are responsible for the implementation of activities and outputs as defined in their respective work plans, mandates and expertise.

**Table 1: Logic Model**

| <b>Outcome</b>   |  |                         |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Poor and vulnerable people have predictable access to adaptive universal social protection   |  |                         |
| <b>Output 1</b>  | <b>Key Activities</b>  | <b>Accountable PUNO</b> |
| Institutional capacities are strengthened for integrated service delivery through the development of evidence-based, gender-responsive social and DRM policy and legislation | 1.1 Review St Lucia legislation to include adaptive social protection and gender-responsiveness, and support review of respective policy (with WB) | UNICEF, WFP             |
|  | 1.2 CODI & roadmap follow-up in Barbados   | ILO, UNDP, UNICEF       |
|  | 1.3 Review St Lucia disaster risk management national plans to include adaptive social protection considerations                                   | WFP                     |
|  | 1.4 Analysis of St Lucia household budgetary survey and other data, including related to gender, to inform policy revision (1.1)                   | UNDP, UNICEF            |
| <b>Output 2</b>  | <b>Key Activities</b>  | <b>Accountable PUNO</b> |
| Innovative financing strategies are introduced to ensure fiscal  | 2.1 Analysis of expenditure and fiscal space for adaptive social   | ILO, UN Women, UNICEF   |

|   |   |                         |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| sustainability for minimum expanded coverage  | protection in Barbados and St Lucia   |                         |
|   | 2.2. Design of new financing Strategies for adaptive and shock-responsive social protection in St Lucia & Barbados                                    | WFP, UNDP               |
| <b>Output 3</b>   | <b>Key Activities</b>   | <b>Accountable PUNO</b> |
| Implementation of national social protection programmes is strengthened with improved management and operational tools  | 3.1 Reviewing and addressing gaps to ensure access to social services to support adaptive universal social protection, including for women (St Lucia) | UNICEF, UN Women        |
|   | 3.2 Reviewing and optimizing delivery mechanisms and supply chain (cash, in kind)   | WFP                     |
|   | 3.3 Procedures for shock response/tailoring social assistance for emergencies   | WFP, UNICEF             |
|   | 3.4 Data analysis & planning  | WFP                     |
| <b>Output 4</b>   | <b>Key Activities</b>   | <b>Accountable PUNO</b> |
| Targeted communities benefit from realignment of social protection programmes designed to strengthen their ability to anticipate, absorb and recover from climate-related shocks and stresses | 4.1 Piloting of community-level shock-responsive social protection interventions in St Lucia  | WFP                     |
|   | 4.2 Analysis of livelihoods, seasonality and risks at community level in Saint Lucia  | WFP                     |
| <b>Output 5</b>   | <b>Key Activities</b>   | <b>Accountable PUNO</b> |
| Regional capacities are strengthened for adaptive social protection by engaging   | 5.1 Strengthening OECS wide framework for adaptive social protection  | UNICEF, ILO, WFP        |

|   |   |          |
|---|---|----------|
| stakeholders for policy coherence and South-South Cooperation | 5.2 South-South Exchange and Learning   | WFP      |
|   | 5.3 Development of a regional census-based approach to measurement of SDG 5.4.1 (unpaid care work) and technical workshop on use of time use data in post-disaster needs assessment | UN Women |

40. By the end of 2021, the JP expected to reach **3,600 vulnerable households** with adaptive social protection programmes. As per the annual progress report, 1,190 households benefited from the programme in 2020. Disaggregated data by the sex of the head of the household is not available.

41. After one year of implementation and as indicated in the annual progress report for 2020, the JP was successful in maintaining and delivering on key results consistent with the overall objectives and Theory of Change, while effectively responding to the changing needs and priorities of supported populations, partner governments/organizations and donors in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The **overall implementation rate at the end of Year 1 was 72%, including actual amounts expended (44%)** and commitments based on ongoing contracts (such as programme personnel and other contractual obligations).

42. In **Barbados**, UN agencies have increased the capacity of the key social protection Ministry by providing additional personnel and delivering social protection training to key staff across ministries. A key achievement was the establishment of a coordination mechanism to support the implementation of a system-wide social protection assessment that will result in specific recommendations to reform the country's social protection system, including making it gender-responsive and establishing links to disaster risk management.

43. In **Saint Lucia**, the government and UN agencies have been working closely on the country's social protection response to COVID-19, supported **by strategic reallocations of JP funds**. The JP an evidence-based response through data collection support to address gaps in key social assistance programmes and co-financing the temporary expansion of national Public Assistance Programme with a 50% increase to children in foster care and children with disabilities, and a 100% increase to persons living with HIV/AIDS. The JP also supported the transition to a permanent expansion of coverage by 38% of the Public Assistance Programme. Simultaneously, the country's overall social protection reform moved forward with support to the legislative review - hand in hand with the ongoing social protection policy review (supported by the World Bank) - and informing future policy options through a microsimulation of poverty (increasing) impacts of COVID-19 and poverty (reducing) effects of different social transfers. Linkages between social protection and disaster risk management stakeholders were strengthened through a consultative road mapping exercise.

44. Further, working jointly with the **OECS**, a coherent regional social protection approach was being strengthened through the development of an OECS Social Protection Strategy to provide guidance to Member States.

45. To support Governments' efforts in responding to the pandemic, while at the same time strengthening their systems through the continued implementation of the JP, focus was placed on actioning the Theory of Change underpinning the JP to increase people's access to social protection that is adaptive and increasingly universal. In Saint Lucia, **the Joint Programme supported the government's response to the impacts of COVID-19 by financially and technically assisting with the expansion** of social assistance, including the flagship Public Assistance Programme (which will trigger a permanent expansion), the Child Disability Grant, children in foster care and persons living with HIV/AIDS. This real-time support was instrumental to increasing access to social protection and preparing social protection systems to respond to shocks in the future. In Barbados and Saint Lucia, **evidence generation was shifted to COVID-19 socio-economic assessments**, looking at the **impact food security and livelihoods and on women and children**

**in particular**, to provide valuable guidance to policymakers in increasing the adaptability and coverage of social protection systems. The repurposing of activities was within the scope of the Joint Programme objectives to strengthen adaptive social protection and the Leave No One Behind approach.

46. No relevant previous evaluation reports that could inform this exercise are known to the implementation team. The evaluation team is expected to expand this search to other informants during the inception and data collection phase.

47. The Joint Programme (JP) addresses gender equality in three ways. Firstly, the Joint Programme seeks to accelerate SDG 5 as an outcome; secondly as a cross-cutting issue throughout the JP; and thirdly, through interventions specific to marginalised women that cannot be addressed through gender-mainstreaming.

48. **Gender, equity and human rights have been taken into account in the design** of the JP. The programme document contains analytical elements related to all of these dimensions and a gender marker (score 2) has been calculated. Specifically, sex-disaggregated data showing the gender differentials in poverty impacts and vulnerabilities are presented, including on those at risk of being left behind (e.g., youth, older persons). Reference is made to country progress on global gender equality normative frameworks. Gender is articulated not only in the language of the output, but through specific action to address the feminization of poverty and inequalities. Activities are designed to ensure that analysis of poverty data inform those on policy and programme reform and five of the 13 indicators measure changes in gender equality by including analysis on gender and/or disaggregation of data by sex. Finally, initial budget allocated to SDG 5 or directly referring to gender was about 32%.

### 3.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

49. The evaluation will look at **all activities** (through different lenses: design, implementation, results) across the different levels (national, community and regional) undertaken within the Joint Programme over its initially expected implementation period: **January 2020 – January 2022**. The two-month extension has been agreed mainly with the purpose to allow partners finalizing the evaluation, therefore it will not be included into the evaluation **chronological scope**.<sup>18</sup> With respect to geographical coverage, the evaluation is expected to look at both, activities implemented in Barbados as well as Saint Lucia.

50. While the results for **all vulnerable groups** outlined in the programme document shall be assessed, the evaluation team is expected to pay **special attention to the results of the programme for women, children and youth, people living with disabilities and other possible disadvantaged or marginalized groups** and provide sufficient analysis in the findings and conclusions for each one of these groups. In addition, it's expected that when relevant, recommendations will take into account different vulnerabilities and needs of these groups. While the JP undertook a gender analysis of social protection in Barbados as well as the Barbados Survey of Living Conditions, the evaluation will need to go further with a gender analysis of Barbados and St Lucia.

51. As persons with disabilities are among the most vulnerable and marginalized groups across countries and considering the critical role that social protection can play in supporting their inclusion, most joint programs had identified them as direct or indirect beneficiaries. In line with the Leaving No One Behind principle and the obligations stemming from the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, even programs that do not target directly persons with disabilities should ensure that persons with disabilities within targeted population can access the program without discrimination.

52. The evaluation will therefore assess to what extent: (i) Joint programme design, implementation, and monitoring have been inclusive of persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, data disaggregation); (ii) Joint programme effectively contributed to the socio-economic inclusion of persons with disabilities by providing income security, coverage of health care, and disability-related costs across the life cycle.

53. Albeit all JP activities should be covered, the time and resources available for this evaluation may not necessarily allow looking at every single support/intervention carried out by each one of the partnering agencies. In this regard, the partners see a particular interest in having the evaluation examine their

---

<sup>18</sup> The programme may be extended to May 2022 pending the SDG Secretariat's decision.

institutional strengthening and capacity building efforts, as well as their work at the regional level and the overall process of collaboration between the PUNO's.

## 4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations

### 4.1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA

54. The evaluation will address the following key questions, which will be further developed and tailored by the evaluation team in a detailed evaluation matrix during the inception phase. The evaluation team is invited to revise the questions following detailed evaluability assessment during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim at highlighting the key lessons and performance of the JP, with a view to informing future strategic and operational decisions.
55. The evaluation should analyse how gender, equity and wider inclusion objectives and gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) mainstreaming principles were included in the intervention design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation and whether the evaluation subject has been guided by system-wide objectives on GEWE. The gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions should be integrated into all evaluation criteria as appropriate.

**Table 2: Evaluation questions and criteria**

| Evaluation questions   |   | Criteria                    |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>EQ1 – To what extent are the Joint Programme design and implementation relevant and coherent?</b> |   | <b>RELEVANCE, COHERENCE</b> |
| 1.1  | To what extent were the JP's scope, estimation of required resources (and expected results based on analysis of available data/needs or capacity assessments)? To what extent were they realistic and relevant? To what extent does this way of designing a joint programme lend to its efficiency, effectiveness, accountability, and support UN Reform? |                             |
| 1.2  | To what extent synergies have been achieved between the different activities implemented by the PUNOs? What value added has been generated through these synergies?   |                             |
| 1.3  | To what extent was the design of the intervention relevant to the wider context (including national policies and work carried out by other actors)?   |                             |
| 1.4  | To what extent was the Joint Programme in line with the needs and priorities of the most vulnerable groups (men and women, boys and girls, people living with disabilities) as final intended beneficiaries? How does the Joint Programme create an enabling environment for the most vulnerable groups to benefit?                                       |                             |
| <b>EQ2 – What are the results of the Joint Programme?</b>  |   | <b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>        |
| 2.1  | To what extent were the expected outcomes and outputs of the Joint Programme accomplished or are likely to be accomplished?   |                             |
| 2.2  | What major factors influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes?   |                             |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2.3   | What are the unintended (positive or negative) outcomes of the Joint Programme (if any)?   |
| 2.4   | To what extent is the achievement of outcomes leading to meeting of Joint Programme goal and further objectives related to acceleration of SDGs and contributing to the UN Reform?   |
| 2.5   | To what extent were the PUNOs able to adapt the implementation of the JP to the COVID-19 context? To what extent was the reprogramming of funds for the COVID-19 response effective and efficient in supporting national response? |
| <b>EQ3 – How efficient was the partnership of the PUNOs in view of implementing the Joint Programme and leveraging further resources?</b> |  |
| <b>EFFICIENCY</b>   |  |
| 3.1   | Which factors facilitated or hindered the collaboration and efficiency of the Joint Programme?   |
| 3.2   | To what extent represents the JP a link to and leverage other development efforts (including national budgets for social protection) to strengthen the social protection systems in Eastern Caribbean?                             |
| 3.3   | To what extent were funds deployed against plan by activity and PUNO in timely manner?   |
| <b>EQ4 – To what longer-term changes has contributed the Joint Programme?</b>   |  |
| <b>IMPACT</b>   |  |
| 4.1   | To what extent has the Joint Programme contributed to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the programme document and particularly that of women, children and youth and people living with disabilities?    |
| 4.2   | What macro level changes have been induced by the programme within the social protection systems of Saint Lucia, Barbados and potentially other ECC?   |
| 4.3   | What are the longer-term effects of the Joint Programme on the OEC Commission's work on social protection?   |
| <b>EQ5 – To what extent are the benefits of the Joint Programme sustainable?</b>  |  |
| <b>SUSTAINABILITY</b>   |  |
| 5.1   | To what extent is it likely that the benefits of the Joint Programme at the national and regional level will continue after its implementation ceases?   |
| 5.2   | To what extent is there government or regional buy-in in the interventions that contributes to their sustainability?   |
| 5.3   | To what extent are the synergies and collaboration created through the Joint Programme between the PUNOs likely to persist after its completion?   |
| <b>EQ6 – To what extent did the Joint Programme take into account and contribute to gender equality, equity and social inclusion?</b>     |  |
| <b>GENDER, EQUITY AND INCLUSION</b>   |  |



|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 6.1 | To what extent was the Joint Programme design, implementation and monitoring sensitive to gender, equity, inclusion of persons with disabilities <sup>19</sup> and social inclusion? |
| 6.2 | What are the concrete results of the Joint Programme in terms of gender equality, women's empowerment, equity, inclusion of persons with disabilities and social inclusion?          |

56. The evaluation will apply all the international evaluation criteria of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. Additionally, the gender, equity and inclusion were also included as a separate criterion provided that the objectives of the Joint Programme are aiming to act upon them.

## 4.2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

57. The detailed methodology will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:

- Employ the above outlined relevant evaluation criteria
- Apply an evaluation matrix geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the data availability challenges, the budget and timing constraints
- Ensure through the application of mixed methods that women, girls, men and boys from different stakeholders' groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used
- Apply participatory and innovative approaches to overcome possible access limitations resulting from the COVID-19 pandemics. The evaluation team is invited to use elements from the [EvaluVision](#) methodology such as visual note-taking and facilitation when engaging with evaluation stakeholders and communicating results.
- Be utilization-focused
- Include a revision of the theory of change of the Joint Programme
- Consider including two case studies on the community level work of the programme (possibly one in St. Lucia and second in Barbados). These case studies may use the most significant change approach.
- Consider using contribution analysis or other appropriate approach to assess the longer-term changes to which the JP has contributed to and national and regional level

58. The methodology chosen should demonstrate attention to impartiality and reduction of bias by relying on mixed methods (quantitative, qualitative) and different primary and secondary data sources that are systematically triangulated (documents from different sources; a range of stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries; direct observation in different locations; across evaluators; across methods etc.). It will take into account any challenges to data availability, validity or reliability, as well as any budget and timing constraints. The evaluation questions, lines of inquiry, indicators, data sources and data collection methods will be brought together in an evaluation matrix, which will form the basis of the sampling approach and data collection and analysis instruments. The following data collection methods are expected to be included alongside others proposed by the evaluation team: desk review, individual and group interviews, and survey. In the context of the pandemics, consideration could be given also to photovoice or 'videovoice' or other less frequently deployed methods.

59. The methodology should be sensitive in terms of GEWE, equity, inclusion and human rights, indicating how the perspectives and voices of diverse groups (men and women, boys, girls, the elderly, people living with disabilities and other marginalized groups) will be sought and taken into account. The methodology should ensure that primary data collected is disaggregated by sex and age; an explanation should be

---

<sup>19</sup> A set of guiding questions to integrate into various data collection instruments was proposed by the SDG Fund Secretariat and is included in Annex 12.

provided if this is not possible. The effort to capture perspectives of diverse group should be made not only at community level but also at institutional level (e.g., when identifying key informants).

60. Looking for explicit consideration of gender and equity/inclusion in the data after fieldwork is too late; the evaluation team must have a clear and detailed plan for collecting data from women and men in gender and equity-sensitive ways before fieldwork begins.
61. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations must reflect gender, equity, and human rights analysis. The findings should include a discussion on intended and unintended effects of the intervention on gender equality, equity, and human rights dimensions. The report should provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender and equity-responsive evaluations in the future.
62. The following mechanisms for independence and impartiality will be employed:
  - (i) Joint Evaluation Steering Committee composed of the heads of the five partnering UN agencies, evaluation manager, WFP evaluation officer and JP Coordinator will be established to validate key deliverables including the Terms of Reference and take other relevant decisions related to the evaluation.
  - (ii) Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) composed of internal and external stakeholders will be established to provide technical advice, comment on evaluation deliverables and act as key informants at inception and possible data collection phase.
  - (iii) An evaluation manager that has not been involved in the implementation of the JP has been nominated. She will be supported and advised by evaluation officer from WFP's regional bureau. Moreover, all key deliverables will be submitted for second-level external quality assurance as per WFP's standard process for decentralized evaluations.
63. The following potential risks to the methodology and mitigation measures have been identified:
  - (i) Due to ongoing COVID-19 pandemics, it is highly likely that the evaluation team will not be able to physically travel to Barbados and Saint Lucia and will have to collect primary data remotely. Sufficient experience has been gathered over the past year and a half on conducting evaluations remotely and the evaluation team shall familiarize themselves with the lessons learnt and good practice for such evaluations to anticipate and avoid possible pitfalls. In case of in-person data collection, the evaluation team is obliged to adhere to relevant national as well as WFP regulation to reduce risk of being infected or spreading the disease. The 'do no harm' principle must stay in the center of decision-making.
  - (ii) A large number of partners (5), with a numerous activity at different levels (community, national, regional) were involved in the JP. Assessing in depth every single activity is likely not to be feasible within the time and budget allocated for this evaluation. Based on the detailed evaluability assessment during the inception phase, the evaluation team needs to confirm the prioritization and scope outlined in the ToR and propose adjustments to the scope and questions if necessary.
  - (iii) It is unlikely that it will be possible to isolate the results and effects of the JP on social protection systems, as multiple interventions by development partners were taking place at the same time. The evaluation team is expected to review and develop in more detail the theory of change of the JP and could consider using contribution analysis to overcome this limitation.
64. The evaluation team will need to expand on the methodology presented in the ToR and develop a detailed evaluation matrix and gender-sensitive sampling strategy in the inception report.

### **4.3. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT**

65. Applying to the UNDP Evaluability Checklist the evaluability of the subject was assessed as feasible. The subject of the evaluation has a clearly defined theory of change, there is a well-defined results framework, secondary data for evaluation, the scope considers political, social and economic factors and the evaluation remains relevant.
66. Several secondary sources of information are available including:

- 2020 monitoring report, quarterly and annual project reports and the coordinator’s monthly reports;
  - WFP’s post-distribution monitoring data on cash transfers in Saint Lucia, case study on shock-responsive social protection in Saint Lucia, workshop report on roadmapping shock-responsive social protection and migration, lessons learned document on shock-responsive social protection pilot;
  - UNICEF’s information on top-ups in Saint Lucia in response to COVID-19, simulation exercise for Saint Lucia, review of legal framework, sectoral budget on social protection;
  - OECS Social Protection Strategy.
67. During the initial consultations, the partners indicated that monitoring and progress reports are complete, of good quality, and no significant data gaps were identified. To confirm this, the evaluation team is expected to carry out a thorough review and appraise the quality of the available secondary data during the inception phase.
68. Further, the following documents are not in possession of the PUNOs and will need to be gathered by the evaluation team:
- Documents from other projects by the World Bank and the Caribbean Development Bank;
  - Country strategies to determine the relevance of the joint programme at the national level;
  - Country policies and action plans on social protection and disaster management.
69. However, there may be a lack of quality gender-disaggregated data and data sets and high staff turnover may mean limited institutional memory. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will be expected to perform an in-depth evaluability assessment and critically assess data availability, quality and gaps expanding on the information provided in this section. This assessment will inform the data collection and the choice of evaluation methods. The evaluation team will need to systematically check accuracy, consistency and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data during the reporting phase.

#### **4.4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

70. The evaluation must conform to [UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation](#). Accordingly, the selected evaluation firm is responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation process. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of respondents, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of respondents, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups) and ensuring that the evaluation results do no harm to respondents or their communities.
71. The evaluation firm will be responsible for managing any potential ethical risks and issues and must put in place, in consultation with the evaluation manager, processes and systems to identify, report and resolve any ethical issues that might arise during the implementation of the evaluation. Ethical approvals and reviews by relevant national and institutional review boards must be sought where required.
72. In case of in person field visits, the evaluation team needs to take into account all necessary bio-security measures (related to COVID-19) and ensure non-maleficence as per ethical standards. No further specific ethical risks were identified at this stage.
73. The team and evaluation manager will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the JP nor have any other potential or perceived conflicts of interest. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the [2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#), including the Pledge of Ethical Conduct as well as the WFP technical note on gender. The evaluation team will also be expected to sign a data protection agreement.

#### **4.5. QUALITY ASSURANCE**

74. The Resident Coordinator (RC)/RCO is responsible and accountable for the oversight and organisation of the evaluation, as a quality assurance measure.
75. The WFP evaluation quality assurance system will be used for the purpose of this joint evaluation. It sets out processes with steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products based on a set of

[Quality Assurance Checklists](#). The quality assurance will be systematically applied during this evaluation and relevant documents will be provided to the evaluation team. This includes checklists for feedback on quality for each of the evaluation products. The relevant checklist will be applied at each stage, to ensure the quality of the evaluation process and outputs.

76. The WFP Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (DEQAS) is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community and aims to ensure that the evaluation process and products conform to best practice. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views or independence of the evaluation team but ensures that the report provides credible evidence and analysis in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.
77. The WFP evaluation manager will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation progresses as per the [DEQAS Process Guide](#) and for conducting a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their finalization.
78. To enhance the quality and credibility of decentralized evaluations, an outsourced quality support (QS) service directly managed by the WFP Office of Evaluation reviews the draft ToR, the draft inception and the evaluation reports, and provides a systematic assessment of their quality from an evaluation perspective, along with recommendations.
79. The evaluation manager will share the assessment and recommendations from the quality support service with the team leader, who will address the recommendations when finalizing the inception and evaluation reports. To ensure transparency and credibility of the process in line with the [UNEG norms and standards](#),<sup>[1]</sup> a rationale should be provided for comments that the team does not take into account when finalizing the report.
80. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the data collection, synthesis, analysis and reporting phases.
81. The evaluation team should be assured of the accessibility of all relevant documentation within the provisions of the directive on disclosure of information. This is available in the [WFP Directive CP2010/001](#) on information disclosure.
82. The commissioning agencies expect that all deliverables from the evaluation team are subject to a thorough quality assurance review by the evaluation firm in line with the WFP evaluation quality assurance system prior to submission of the deliverables.
83. All final evaluation reports will be subject to a post hoc quality assessment (PHQA) by an independent entity through a process that is managed by the Office of Evaluation. The overall PHQA results will be published on the WFP website alongside the evaluation report.

## 5. Organization of the evaluation

### 5.1. PHASES AND DELIVERABLES

84. Table 4 presents the structure of the main phases of the evaluation, along with the deliverables and deadlines for each phase. Annex 2 presents a more detailed timeline.

| Table 4: Summary timeline – key evaluation milestones |                     |                        |             |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Main phases   | Indicative timeline | Tasks and deliverables | Responsible |
|   |                     |                        |             |

<sup>[1]</sup> UNEG Norm #7 states “that transparency is an essential element that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability”

|                                |                        |  |                                     |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Preparation                 | <b>Jul – Oct 21</b>    | Preparation of ToR<br>Selection of the evaluation team & contracting<br>Document review  | Evaluation manager                  |
| 2. Inception                   | <b>Dec 21 – Jan 22</b> | Inception mission<br>Inception report  | Evaluation team leader              |
| 3. Data collection             | <b>Jan 22</b>          | Fieldwork<br>Exit debriefing (PPT)   | Evaluation team leader              |
| 4. Reporting                   | <b>Feb – Mar 22</b>    | Data analysis and report drafting<br>Comments process<br>Recommendation’s validation and learning workshop<br>Evaluation report<br>Video + 2-pager brief | Evaluation team leader              |
| 5. Dissemination and follow-up | <b>Apr 22</b>          | Management response<br>Dissemination of the evaluation report  | Joint Evaluation Steering Committee |

## 5.2. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

85. The evaluation team is expected to include two to four members, including the team leader and a mix of national (OECS) and international evaluators of different level of experience.<sup>20</sup> In view of evaluation capacity strengthening, the inclusion of one young or emerging evaluator into the team (ideally OECS national) should be envisaged. To the extent possible, the evaluation will be conducted by a gender-balanced and geographically and culturally diverse team with appropriate skills to assess gender dimensions of the subject as specified in the scope, approach and methodology sections of the ToR. At least one team member should have experience with evaluations commissioned by UN Agencies following UNEG norms and standards.

86. The team will be multi-disciplinary and include members who, together, include an appropriate balance of technical expertise and practical knowledge in the following areas:

- Social protection and adaptive social protection
- Capacity strengthening
- Policy development and analysis
- Partnerships work
- Good knowledge of gender, equity and wider inclusion issues
- Knowledge of the cultural context

<sup>20</sup> In case of lack of available national evaluators, team members knowledgeable of the Caribbean region could be considered.

- All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills, evaluation experience with a track record of written work on similar assignments, and familiarity with the region
  - Fluency in English is required
87. The team leader will have expertise in one of the key competencies listed above as well as demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations, including designing methodology and data collection tools. She/he will also have leadership, analytical and communication skills, including a track record of excellent English writing, synthesis and presentation skills. Her/his primary responsibilities will be: i) defining the evaluation approach and methodology; ii) guiding and managing the team; iii) leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team; and iv) drafting and revising, as required, the inception report, the end of field work (i.e. exit) debriefing presentation and evaluation report in line with DEQAS.
88. Team members will: i) contribute to the methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; ii) conduct field work; iii) participate in team meetings and meetings with stakeholders; and iv) contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in their technical area(s).
89. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its team leader and in close communication with the joint evaluation manager. The team will be hired following agreement Evaluation Steering Committee on its composition.

### 5.3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

90. The Resident Coordinator organizes the evaluation and provides the strategic oversight of the evaluation process, including the approval of key outputs.
91. The WFP Caribbean multi-country office **management (Director)** will take responsibility to:
- Manage the evaluation by assigning an evaluation manager for the evaluation.
  - Compose the Joint Evaluation Steering Committee and the Evaluation Reference Group (see below)
92. The **evaluation manager** manages the evaluation process through all phases including: drafting this ToR; identifying the evaluation team; preparing and managing the budget; setting up the evaluation committee and evaluation reference group; ensuring quality assurance mechanisms are operational and effectively used; consolidating and sharing comments on draft inception and evaluation reports with the evaluation team; ensuring that the team has access to all documentation and information necessary to the evaluation; facilitating the team's contacts with local stakeholders; supporting the preparation of the field mission by setting up meetings and field visits, providing logistic support during the fieldwork and arranging for interpretation, if required; organizing security briefings for the evaluation team and providing any materials as required; and conducting the first level quality assurance of the evaluation products. The evaluation manager will be the main interlocutor between the team, represented by the team leader and the firm's focal point, and PUNOs to ensure a smooth implementation process.
93. A **Joint Evaluation Steering Committee** is formed to help ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation, it will be co-chaired by the RC and the head of the PUNO managing the evaluation (WFP) and will take responsibility to:
- i. Approve the final ToR, inception and evaluation reports
  - ii. Approve the evaluation team selection
  - iii. Ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation at all stages,
  - iv. Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and the evaluation subject, its performance and results with the evaluation manager and the evaluation team
  - v. Organize and participate in two separate debriefings, one internal and one with external stakeholders
  - vi. Oversee dissemination and follow-up processes, including the preparation of a management response to the evaluation recommendations.
94. An **evaluation reference group (ERG)** is formed as an advisory body with representation from internal and external stakeholders (see Annex 3). The evaluation reference group members will review and comment on the draft evaluation products and act as key informants in order to contribute to the relevance, impartiality and credibility of the evaluation by offering a range of viewpoints and ensuring a transparent process.

95. **WFP's regional bureau** will take responsibility to:
- Advise the evaluation manager and provide support to the evaluation process where appropriate
  - Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the evaluation subject as required
  - Provide comments on the draft ToR, inception and evaluation reports
  - Support the preparation of a management response to the evaluation and track the implementation of the recommendations.
96. While the evaluation officer - Michala Assankpon - will perform most of the above responsibilities, other regional bureau-relevant technical staff may participate in the evaluation reference group and/or comment on evaluation products as appropriate.
97. Other Stakeholders that have been preliminary identified in Table 1 are expected to be actively involved in the different phases of the process as appropriate.
98. **The Office of Evaluation (OEV).** OEV is responsible for overseeing WFP decentralized evaluation function, defining evaluation norms and standards, managing the outsourced quality support service, publishing as well submitting the final evaluation report to the Post-hoc Quality Assessment. OEV also ensures a help desk function and advises the Regional Evaluation Unit, the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation teams when required. Internal and external stakeholders and/or the evaluators are encouraged to reach out to the regional evaluation officer and the Office of Evaluation helpdesk (wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org) in case of potential impartiality breaches or non-adherence to UNEG ethical guidelines.

## 5.4. SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

99. **Security clearance** where required is to be obtained from WFP Caribbean multi-country office.
- As an “independent supplier” of evaluation services to WFP, the contracted firm will be responsible for ensuring the security of the evaluation team, and adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or situational reasons. However, to avoid any security incidents, the evaluation manager will ensure that the WFP country office registers the team members with the security officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground. The evaluation team must observe applicable United Nations Department of Safety and Security rules including taking security training (BSAFE & SSAFE) and attending in-country briefings. Due consideration should be given to any gender-specific risks the team members may be exposed to during the potential field mission.
100. To avoid any security incidents, the evaluation manager is requested to ensure that:
- The WFP country office registers the team members with the security officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground
  - The team members observe applicable United Nations security rules and regulations – e.g., curfews etc.

## 5.5. COMMUNICATION

101. To ensure a smooth and efficient process and enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation team should place emphasis on transparent and open communication with key stakeholders. These will be achieved by ensuring a clear agreement on channels and frequency of communication with and between key stakeholders. The evaluation team leader is expected to communicate with the evaluation manager appointed for this mandate who will streamline the communication with the PUNOs focal points and management, as well as other internal and external stakeholders as necessary.
102. Specifically, the evaluation manager, will be responsible for:
- Sharing all draft products including the TOR, inception report, and evaluation report with internal and external stakeholders to solicit their feedback; the communication will specify the date by when the feedback is expected and highlight next steps;



- Documenting systematically how stakeholders' feedback has been used in finalising the product, ensuring that where feedback has not been used a rationale is provided;
- Informing stakeholders (through the ERG) of planned meetings at least three days before and where appropriate sharing the agenda for such meetings;
- Informing the team leader in advance about the people who have been invited for meetings in which the team leader is expected to participate and sharing the agenda in advance; and
- Sharing evaluation products (TOR, inception and evaluation report) with all of the internal and external stakeholders for their information and action as appropriate.

103.The evaluation team leader will be responsible for:

- Communicating the rationale for the evaluation design decisions (sampling, methodology, tools) in the inception report and through discussions;
- Working with the evaluation manager to ensure a detailed evaluation schedule is communicated to stakeholders before field work starts (annexed to the inception report);
- Sharing a brief PowerPoint presentation before the debriefings to enable stakeholders joining the briefings remotely to follow the discussions;
- Including in the final report the list of people interviewed, as appropriate (bearing in mind confidentiality and protection issues); and
- Systematically considering all stakeholder feedback when finalising the evaluation report, and transparently providing rationale for feedback that was not used.

104.Should translators be required for fieldwork, the evaluation firm will make arrangements and include the cost in the financial offer.

105.Based on the stakeholder analysis, the communication and knowledge management plan (in Annex 5) identifies the users of the evaluation to involve in the process and to whom the report should be disseminated. The communication and knowledge management plan indicates how findings including gender, equity and wider inclusion issues will be disseminated and how stakeholders interested in, or affected by, gender, equity and wider inclusion issues will be engaged.

106.As part of the international standards for evaluation, WFP requires that all evaluations are made publicly available. It is important that evaluation reports are accessible to a wide audience, thereby contributing to the credibility of WFP – through transparent reporting – and the use of evaluation. Following the approval of the final evaluation report, the report and associated deliverables will be disseminated as per Annex 5.

107.Besides the main report that should conform to the WFP template and standards, further deliverables are requested: 2-3 pager visually attractive summary in English and Spanish, 3- to 4-minute video communicating the key findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learnt.

## **5.6. BUDGET**

108.The evaluation will be financed from the JP funds that are included under WFP's budget. The evaluation services will be paid in three instalments as follows:

- 20% upon contracting i.e., signing of the Purchase order
- 20% upon submission of technically satisfactory final inception report
- 60% upon approval of technically satisfactory final evaluation and associated deliverables as specified above by the Joint Steering Committee.

109.The offer will include a detailed budget for the evaluation, including consultant fees, travel costs and other costs (interpreters, etc.). Travel/subsistence/other direct expenses should be accounted for in the proposed financial offer in accordance with the conditions of the long-term agreement signed with WFP.

110. Please send any queries through the in-tend platform within the first seven calendar days from receiving the invitation to participate in the mini-bid.

# Annexes

## Annex 1: Maps



Map of Barbados – Source: Mapsoftheworld.com



Map of Saint Lucia – Source: Worldometers.info

## Annex 2: Timeline

|                                  | Phases, deliverables and timeline  | Key dates            |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| <b>Phase 1 - Preparation</b>     |  | <b>Up to 9 weeks</b> |
| EM                               | Desk review, draft ToR and quality assurance (QA) by EM and REO using ToR QC   | (2 weeks)            |
| EM                               | Share draft ToR with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS  | (3 days)             |
| EM                               | Review draft ToR based on DEQS and REU feedback and share with ERG   | (3 days)             |
| EM                               | Start identification of evaluation team  | 1 day                |
| ERG                              | Review and comment on draft ToR  | (2 weeks)            |
| EM/EC                            | Review draft ToR based on comments received and submit final ToR to EC and Joint SDG Fund  | (1 week)             |
| EC and RC                        | <b>EC endorses and RC approves the final ToR and share with ERG and key stakeholders</b>   | (1 week)             |
| EM                               | Assess evaluation proposals and recommends team selection  | (3 days)             |
| EM                               | Evaluation team recruitment/contracting  | (2 weeks)            |
| EC Co-Chairs                     | <b>Approve evaluation team selection and recruitment of evaluation team</b>  | (1 week)             |
| <b>Phase 2 - Inception</b>       |  | <b>Up to 7 weeks</b> |
| EM/TL                            | Brief core team  | (1 day)              |
| ET                               | Desk review of key documents   | 3 days               |
|                                  | Remote Inception mission   | (1 week)             |
| ET                               | Draft inception report   | (1 week)             |
| EM                               | Quality assurance of draft IR by EM and REU using QC, share draft IR with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS | (1 week)             |
| ET                               | Review draft IR based on feedback received by DEQS, EM and REO   | (1 week)             |
| EM                               | Share revised IR with ERG  |                      |
| ERG                              | Review and comment on draft IR   | (2 weeks)            |
| EM                               | Consolidate comments   |                      |
| ET                               | Review draft IR based on feedback received and submit final revised IR   | (1 week)             |
| EM                               | Review final IR and submit to the evaluation committee for review  |                      |
| EC and RC                        | <b>EC endorses and RC approves final IR and share with ERG for information</b>   | <b>(1 week)</b>      |
| <b>Phase 3 – Data collection</b> |  | <b>Up to 3 weeks</b> |
| EC / EM                          | Brief the evaluation team at CO  | (1 day)              |
| ET                               | <b>Data collection</b>   | (3 weeks)            |

|  |   |                       |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| ET   | <b>In-country debriefing (s)</b>  | (1 day)               |
| <b>Phase 4 - Reporting</b>                   |   | <b>Up to 11 weeks</b> |
| ET   | Draft evaluation report   | (2 weeks)             |
| EM   | Quality assurance of draft ER by EM and REO using the QC, share draft ER with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS                | (1 week)              |
| ET   | Review and submit draft ER based on feedback received by DEQS, EM and REO   | (1 week)              |
| EM   | Circulate draft ER for review and comments to ERG, RB and other stakeholders  |                       |
| ERG  | Review and comment on draft ER  | (2 weeks)             |
| EM   | Consolidate comments received   |                       |
| ET   | Review draft ER based on feedback received and submit final revised ER  | (2 weeks)             |
| EM   | Review final revised ER and submit to the evaluation committee for review   |                       |
| EC and RC                                    | <b>EC endorses and RC approves final evaluation report and share with key stakeholders for information</b>  | <b>(2 weeks)</b>      |
| <b>Phase 5 - Dissemination and follow-up</b> |   | <b>Up to 4 weeks</b>  |
| EC   | Prepare management response   | (4 weeks)             |
| RC   | <b>Review and Approve Management Response</b>   | <b>(1 week)</b>       |
| EM   | <b>Share final evaluation report and management response with the REU and WFP's OEV for publication and participate in end-of-evaluation lessons learned call</b> |                       |

# Annex 3: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Committee

**Purpose and role:** The purpose of the joint evaluation steering committee (EC) is to ensure a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation in accordance with UNEG norms and standards as well as WFP evaluation policy. It will achieve this by supporting the evaluation manager in making decisions, reviewing draft deliverables (ToR, inception report and evaluation report) and submitting them for review and endorsement by the PUNOs Director who are members of the committee and approval by the RC.

**Composition:** The evaluation committee will be composed of the following staff:

- UN Resident Coordinator – Didier Trebucq (Co-Chair of the Evaluation Committee)
- WFP Caribbean Office Director – Regis Chapman (Co-Chair of the Evaluation Committee)
- UNICEF Caribbean Office Director – Aloys Kamuragiye
- ILO Office Director – Dennis Zulu
- UNDP Office Deputy Director – Ugo Blanco
- UN Women Office Director - Tonni Ann Brodber
- Evaluation manager – Shari Inniss-Grant (Evaluation Committee Secretariat)
- Joint Programme Coordinator – Lilia Debrah Ramjeawan Malaykhan
- WFP evaluation officer – Michala Assankpon

# Annex 4: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Reference Group

**Purpose and role:** The evaluation reference group (ERG) is an advisory group providing advice and feedback to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team at key moments during the evaluation process. It is established during the preparatory stage of the evaluation and is mandatory for all decentralized evaluations.

The overall purpose of the evaluation reference group is to contribute to the credibility, utility and impartiality of the evaluation. For this purpose, its composition and role are guided by the following principles:

- **Transparency:** Keeping relevant stakeholders engaged and informed during key steps ensures transparency throughout the evaluation process
- **Ownership and Use:** Stakeholders' participation enhances ownership of the evaluation process and products, which in turn may impact on its use
- **Accuracy:** Feedback from stakeholders at key steps of the preparatory, data collection and reporting phases contributes to accuracy of the facts and figures reported in the evaluation and of its analysis.

Members are expected to review and comment on draft evaluation deliverables and share relevant insights at key consultation points of the evaluation process.

The main roles of the evaluation reference group are as follows:

- Review and comment on the draft ToR
- Suggest key references and data sources in their area of expertise
- Participate in face-to-face or virtual briefings to the evaluation team during the inception phase and/or evaluation phase
- Review and comment on the draft inception report
- Participate in field debriefings (optional)
- Review and comment on the draft evaluation report and related annexes, with a particular focus on: a) factual errors and/or omissions that could invalidate the findings or change the conclusions; b) issues of political sensitivity that need to be refined in the way they are addressed or in the language used; c) recommendations
- Participate in learning workshops to validate findings and discuss recommendations
- Provide guidance on suggested communications products to disseminate learning from the evaluation.



## Composition

| Country level  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• UN Resident Coordinator Office – Kenroy Roach / Lorraine Nicholas</li><li>• WFP Head of Office a.i. – Regis Chapman</li><li>• UNICEF Representative - Aloys Kamuragiye</li><li>• ILO Representative - Dennis Zulu</li><li>• UNDP Deputy Representative - Ugo Blanco</li><li>• UN Women Representative - Tonni Ann Brodber</li><li>• Multi-Country Strategic Planning Consultant - Shari Inniss-Grant</li><li>• WFP Head of Programmes - Sarah Bailey</li><li>• UNDP Joint Programme Coordinator – Andrea Richards-Cummins</li><li>• UNDP M&amp;E Associate – Sacha Lindo</li><br/><li>• ILO Specialist, Social Protection and Occupational Safety and Health - Ariel Pino</li><li>• UN Women Programme Specialist - Isiuwa Iyahun</li><li>• UNICEF Social Policy Manager - Celine Felix</li><li>• UNDP Cluster Manager - Poverty, Governance and Monitoring and Evaluation - Jason La Corbiniere</li><li>• ILO Senior Programme Officer - Ingerlyn Caines-Frances</li><li>• UNICEF M&amp;E Specialist -Patrice Bosso</li></ul> |
| Regional bureaux   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• UN Women Regional Evaluation Specialist Michael Craft</li><li>• WFP Regional Bureau Evaluation Officer – Michala Assankpon</li><li>• WFP Regional Social Protection Adviser – Giulia Baldi</li><li>• WFP Regional Social Protection Consultant – Ana Solorzano</li></ul>   |
| External Stakeholders invited to joint the ERG according to their time possibility   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of Equity for St Lucia - Velda Joseph</li><li>• Coordinator, Ministry of People Empowerment, Barbados - Andrew Pollard</li><li>• OECS Commission Representative - Carlene Radix</li><li>• World Bank Representative - Clemente Avila Parra</li></ul>  |

# Annex 5: Communication and Knowledge Management Plan

## Internal communication plan

| <b>When</b><br><i>Evaluation phase</i> | <b>What-</b><br><i>Communication product/information</i> | <b>To whom-</b> <i>Target group or individuals / position</i>  | <b>From whom</b><br><i>Lead commissioning office staff</i> | <b>How (in what way)</b><br><i>Communication means</i> | <b>Why-Purpose of communication</b>  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Preparation/<br>TOR                    | Draft TOR  | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group, PUNOs management and programme staff  | Evaluation manager on behalf of the evaluation committee   | Email  | To get comments  |
|  | Final TOR  | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group<br><br>PUNOS office management and programme staff<br><br>Relevant support staff   | Evaluation manager   | Email  | -Inform the relevant staff of the overall plan for the evaluation, including critical dates and milestones.<br><br>-informs the support staff on the selected option for contracting team  |
| Inception                              | Draft Inception report                                   | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group<br><br>PUNOS office management and programme staff   | Evaluation manager on behalf of the evaluation committee   | Email  | To get comments  |
|  | Final Inception Report                                   | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group<br><br>PUNOS office management and programme staff<br><br>Relevant support staff<br><br>Field level staff (sub-offices, field offices, area offices) | Evaluation manager   | Email  | Inform the relevant staff of the detailed plan for the evaluation, including critical dates and milestones; sites to be visited; stakeholders to be engaged etc.<br><br>Informs the support staff (especially administration) of required logistical support |

| <b>When</b><br><i>Evaluation phase</i> | <b>What-</b><br><i>Communication product/information</i>    | <b>To whom-</b> <i>Target group or individuals / position</i>   | <b>From whom</b><br><i>Lead commissioning office staff</i>              | <b>How (in what way)</b><br><i>Communication means</i>           | <b>Why-Purpose of communication</b>   |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Data collection                        | Debriefing power-point                                      | PUNOS office management and programme staff   | Team leader (may be sent to EM who then forwards to the relevant staff) | Email  | Allow reflection on the preliminary findings before the scheduled debriefing  |
| Data Analysis and Reporting            | Draft Evaluation report                                     | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group<br>PUNOS office management and programme staff                  | Evaluation manager, on behalf of the evaluation committee               | Email  | Request for comments on the draft report  |
|  | Final evaluation Report                                     | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group<br>PUNOS office management and programme staff<br>-Global PUNOs | Evaluation manager on behalf of the evaluation committee                | Email<br>-   | Informing internal stakeholders of the final main product from the evaluation<br>Making the report available publicly                           |
| Dissemination & Follow-up              | Draft Management Response to the evaluation recommendations | - PUNOs Programme and M&E staff<br>-Relevant RBx staff  | Evaluation manager, on behalf of the evaluation committee               | Email,<br>And management response preparation workshop           | Communicate the suggested actions on recommendations and elicit comments<br>Discuss the PUNOs' action to address the evaluation recommendations |
|  | Final management Response                                   | -Staff in the PUNOs' offices<br>-Global PUNOs   | Evaluation manager  | Email, plus shared folders<br><br>Posting report and MR on WFPgo | Ensure that all relevant staff are informed on the commitments made on taking actions<br>Make MR accessible across PUNOs                        |

## External Communication Plan

| <b>When</b><br><i>Evaluation phase</i> | <b>What-</b><br><i>Communication product/information</i> | <b>To whom-</b> <i>Target group or individuals / position</i>  | <b>From whom</b><br><i>Lead commissioning office staff</i> | <b>How (in what way)</b><br><i>Communication means</i>                        | <b>Why-Purpose of communication</b>   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Preparation                            | Draft TOR  | Key stakeholders Through the Evaluation reference Group; and directly to stakeholders not represented in the ERG | Evaluation manager   | Email; plus a meeting of the ERG if required                                  | To seek for review and comments on TOR  |
|  | Final TOR  | Key stakeholders Through the Evaluation reference Group; and/or directly   | Chair of Joint Steering Committee                          | Email; plus discussions during scheduled coordination meetings as appropriate | Informing stakeholders of the overall plan, purpose, scope and timing of the evaluation; and their role           |
| Inception                              | Draft Inception report                                   | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group; and/or directly   | Evaluation manager   | Email   | To seek for review and comments on draft Inception report   |
|  | Final Inception Report                                   | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group; and/or directly   | Chair of Joint Steering Committee                          | Email; plus discussions during scheduled coordination meetings as appropriate | Informing stakeholders of the detailed plan of the evaluation; and their role including when they will be engaged |
| Data collection and analysis debrief   | Debriefing power-point                                   | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group; and/or directly   | Evaluation manager   | Email   | Invite the stakeholders to the external debriefing meeting, to discuss the preliminary findings                   |
| Reporting                              | Draft Evaluation report                                  | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group; and/or directly   | Evaluation manager, on behalf of the evaluation committee  | Email   | Request for comments on the draft report  |

| <b>When</b><br><i>Evaluation phase</i> | <b>What-</b><br><i>Communication product/ information</i>   | <b>To whom-</b> <i>Target group or individuals / position</i>   | <b>From whom</b><br><i>Lead commissioning office staff</i>   | <b>How (in what way)</b><br><i>Communication means</i>  | <b>Why-</b> <i>Purpose of communication</i>   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|  | Final evaluation Report                                     | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group; and/or directly<br><br>External technical audience | Evaluation manager; plus the joint programme coordinator<br><br>Evaluation manager<br><br>Focal point at the partner organizations | Email<br><br>Posting report on <a href="http://WFP.org">WFP.org</a><br><br>Posting on partners websites | Informing all key stakeholders of the final main product from the evaluation<br><br>Making the report available publicly          |
| Dissemination & Follow-up              | Draft Management Response to the evaluation recommendations | Key stakeholders through the Evaluation reference Group; and/or directly                                    | Evaluation manager, on behalf of the evaluation committee  | -Email,   | Communicate the suggested actions on recommendations and elicit comments, especially on actions required by external stakeholders |
|  | Final Management response                                   | External technical audience   | Evaluation manager<br><br>Focal point at the partner organizations   | -Posting on <a href="http://WFP.org">WFP.org</a><br><br>Posting on partners websites                    | Making the MR available publicly  |

## Annex 6: Bibliography

Human Rights Council (2015), Universal Periodic Review, Available online:  
<https://www.refworld.org/topic,50ffbce51b1,50ffbce5208,5832fee74,0,,,LCA.html>

IDB (2018), Report on Country Development Challenges, Available online:  
<https://publications.iadb.org/publications/english/document/Caribbean-Region-Quarterly-Bulletin-Volume-7-Issue-3-September-2018.pdf>

Kairi Consultants for OECS Commission (2018), Saint Lucia National Report of Living Conditions 2016, Available online: [https://www.stats.gov.lc/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Saint-Lucia-National-Report-of-Living-Conditions-2016-Final\\_December-2018.pdf](https://www.stats.gov.lc/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Saint-Lucia-National-Report-of-Living-Conditions-2016-Final_December-2018.pdf)

UNDP (2021), Gender-responsive Assessment of Barbados' COVID-19 Social Protection Response

UNICEF (2017), Child Poverty in the Eastern Caribbean, Available online:  
<https://www.unicef.org/easterncaribbean/media/1176/file/child-poverty-in-the-eastern-caribbean-area-2017.pdf>

WFP and partners (2019), Joint Programme Document

World Bank Data Indicators, available at <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator>.

## Annex 7: Acronyms

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>BERT</b>  | Barbados Economic Recovery and Transformation Programme |
| <b>CBD</b>   | Caribbean Development Bank                              |
| <b>CDEMA</b> | Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency          |
| <b>CODI</b>  | Core Diagnostic Instrument                              |
| <b>ECC</b>   | Eastern Caribbean Countries                             |
| <b>GEWE</b>  | Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment                 |
| <b>HQ</b>    | Headquarters  |
| <b>IFI</b>   | International Financial Institutions                    |
| <b>ILO</b>   | International Labour Organization                       |
| <b>JP</b>    | Joint Programme   |
| <b>MCO</b>   | Multi-country Office                                    |
| <b>NEMO</b>  | National Emergency Management Organization              |
| <b>OECS</b>  | Organization of Eastern Caribbean States                |
| <b>OEV</b>   | Office of Evaluation                                    |
| <b>PAP</b>   | Public Assistance Programme                             |
| <b>PUNO</b>  | Partnering United Nations Organizations                 |
| <b>RB</b>    | Regional Bureau   |
| <b>RC</b>    | Resident Coordinator                                    |
| <b>RCO</b>   | Resident Coordinator's Office                           |
| <b>SDG</b>   | Sustainable Development Goal                            |
| <b>SIDs</b>  | Small Island Development states                         |
| <b>TOR</b>   | Terms of Reference                                      |
| <b>UN</b>    | United Nations  |
| <b>UNCT</b>  | United Nations Country Team                             |
| <b>UNDP</b>  | United Nations Development Programme                    |
| <b>WFP</b>   | World Food Programme                                    |



## Annex 8: Results Framework

| Result / Indicators  | Baseline | Expected 2020 target | 2020 Result   | Reasons for variance from planned target (if any) | Expected 2021 target | Expected final target (if different from 2021) |
|--|----------|----------------------|---|---|----------------------|--|
| <b>Outcome 1: Poor and vulnerable people have predictable access to universal adaptive social protection.</b>  |          |                      |   |   |                      |  |
| Outcome 1 indicator:<br>Number of households benefiting from adaptive social protection programmes (disaggregated by female/male-led household)  | 0        | 0                    | 1190<br>(disaggregated data by female/male-led not available) | Reallocations to support COVID-19 response        | 3600                 | 4714   |
| Outcome 1 indicator:<br>Social protection adaptivity and universality score (composite indicator, including gender)  | 0        | 3                    | 3   |   | 3.25                 |  |
| Outcome 1 Indicator:<br>Number of recommendations from Joint Programme adopted in policies and programmes  | 0        | 0                    | 1   | N/A   | 3                    | 4  |
| <b>Output 1.1: Institutional capacities strengthened for integrated service delivery through the development of evidence based, gender responsive social and disaster risk management policy and legislation</b> |          |                      |   |   |                      |  |
| Output 1.1 Indicator:<br>Number of social protection or DRM policies drafted including adaptive or   | 0        | 0                    | 0   | N/A   | 1                    | 1  |

|  |                 |                             |                          |   |                             |   |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| shock-responsive social protection   |                 |                             |                          |   |                             |   |
| Output 1.1 Indicator:<br>Number of reports produced analyzing vulnerability (including disaggregation of data by sex)                  | 0               | 1                           | 0                        | Funds for child vulnerability analysis in Saint Lucia were reallocated to Covid-19 poverty impact modelling | 1                           | 2   |
| <b>Output 1.2: Innovative financial strategies introduced to ensure fiscal sustainability and expanded coverage.</b>                   |                 |                             |                          |   |                             |   |
| Output 1.2 Indicator:<br>Number of social protection fiscal analyses/expenditure reviews   | 0               | 0                           | 0                        | Planned for Year 2  | 2                           | 2   |
| <b>Result / Indicators</b>   | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Expected 2020 target</b> | <b>2020 Result</b>       | <b>Reasons for variance from planned target (if any)</b>  | <b>Expected 2021 target</b> | <b>Expected final target (if different from 2021)</b> |
| Output 1.2. Indicator:<br>Number of forward-looking financing strategies developed   | 0               | 0                           | 0                        | Planned for Year 2  | 1                           | 1   |
| <b>Output 1.3: Implementation of national social protection programmes strengthened with improved management and operational tools</b> |                 |                             |                          |   |                             |   |
| Output 1.3 Indicator:<br>Number of tools, protocols and manuals on adaptive systems developed  | 0               | 0                           | 1                        | N/A   | 1                           | 2   |
| Output 1.3 Indicator:  | 0               | 0                           | 40 (38 Females, 2 males) | N/A   | TBD                         | TBD   |

|  |                 |                             |   |  |                             |   |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|---|
| Number of government staff trained (disaggregated by sex)  |                 |                             |   |  |                             |   |
| <b>Output 1.4: Targeted communities' benefit from piloted social protection programmes designed to strengthen their ability to anticipate, absorb and recover from climate-related shocks and stresses</b> |                 |                             |   |  |                             |   |
| Output 1.4 Indicator:<br>Number of households targeted receiving cash transfers through adapted social protection programmes in Saint Lucia (disaggregated by female/male-led household)                   | 0               | 0                           | 740<br>(disaggregated data by female/male-led households not available) | N/A  | 3600                        | 4714  |
| Output 1.4 Indicator:<br>Number of changes made as a result of pilot to social protection or DRM data management systems, delivery mechanisms, targeting, coordination or financing systems                | 0               | 0                           | 0   | N/A  | TBD                         | TBD   |
| <b>Result / Indicators</b>   | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Expected 2020 target</b> | <b>2020 Result</b>  | <b>Reasons for variance from planned target (if any)</b> | <b>Expected 2021 target</b> | <b>Expected final target (if different from 2021)</b> |
| <b>Output 1.5: Regional capacities strengthened by adaptive social protection through engaging stakeholders for policy and legal coherence and south-south cooperation</b>                                 |                 |                             |   |  |                             |   |
| Output 1.5 Indicator:<br>Number of South-South Cooperation,  | 0               | 0                           | 2   | N/A  | 3                           | 5   |

|   |   |   |   |     |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|
| knowledge-exchange and learning events  |   |   |   |     |   |   |
| Output 1.5 Indicator:<br>Number of regional frameworks, strategies and plans revised to include adaptive social protection considerations | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | 1 | 1 |

# Annex 9: Theory of Change

|   |
|---|
| <b>IMPACT:</b> Reduced structural inequalities for poverty reduction and resilience building        |
| <b>OUTCOME:</b> Poor and vulnerable have predictable access to universal adaptive social protection |

## OUTPUTS

| National Level  |  |  | Community Level  | Regional Level  |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Institutional capacities are strengthened for integrated service delivery through the development of evidence based, gender responsive social and disaster risk management policy and legislation | Innovative Financial strategies are introduced to ensure fiscal sustainability for minimum and expanded coverage | Implementation of national social protection programmes is strengthened with improved management and operational tools | Targeted communities benefit from piloted social protection programmes designed to strengthen their ability to anticipate, absorb and recover from climate-related shocks and stresses | Regional capacities are strengthened for adaptive social protection by engaging stakeholders for legal and policy coherence and south-south cooperation |

|   |
|---|
| <b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES:</b> Gender equality, climate change, inter-ministerial and regional policy coherence, capacity strengthening |
|---|

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>ASSUMPTIONS:</b> Continued government and partners’ commitment at national, community and regional level; fiscal policies and related reforms keeping budget deficits and debt levels at current/lower level; space and platforms for evidence to inform decision-making; regional mechanisms and institutions can support regional policy coherence for social resilience; donor and development partner support for programme complementarity.</p> <p><b>RISKS:</b> Lack of buy-in and availability and allocation of resources (financial &amp; non-financial); institutional risks (Governance, accountability and misuse of resources); programmatic risks (gender and/or age discriminatory roles and practices, implementation and monitoring); contextual risks, such as hurricanes/storms/flooding and environmental and social sustainability.</p> <p><b>MITIGATION:</b> Working closely with governments/partners and alignment with national and regional priorities, supporting ongoing budget analysis and fiscal space; multi-sectoral coordination mechanism with senior level government/partners and UN HoAs incl. joint monitoring and reporting, building on UNCT mechanism, plus technical group meetings; technical support to advise on gender and discriminatory practices; diverting attention to responding to shocks building on the proposed tools and advocacy; support the development of social management plans.</p> |
|--|

## Annex 10: List of Related Initiatives

| Name of initiative/project   | Key expected results  | Links to the joint programme  | Lead organization  | Other partners  | Budget and funding source -USD   | Contract person (name and email)   |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Strengthening Human Development in Barbados  | The project will contribute to: (i) alleviate extreme and moderate poverty in SSN beneficiary households; and (ii) improve the labor market outcomes (employment rate, earnings) of SSN and ALMP beneficiaries  | The CODI social protection assessment and follow-up will inform overall system linkages, highlighting, amongst others, issues with targeting, programme(s) and service delivery | Ministry of People Empowerment and Elder Affairs (MPEA)                  |   | Inter-American Development Bank<br>10,000,000  | Juan Carlos De La Hoz Vinas,<br><a href="mailto:juancarlos@iadb.org">juancarlos@iadb.org</a>   |
| Saint Lucia Human Capital Resilience Project   | Improve the labor market relevance of skills and targeting of social programs in Saint Lucia.   | The Joint Programme focuses on areas complementary to the loan, including policy development/legislation, vulnerability data analysis and community piloting.                   | Ministry of Finance, Economic Growth, Job Creation, and External Affairs | Ministry of Education, Innovation, Gender Relations and Sustainable Development; Ministry of Equity, Social Justice, Local Government and Empowerment; Ministry of Infrastructure, Ports, Energy and Labour | World Bank<br>20,000,000 (incl. social protection and technical vocation components) | Clemente Ávila,<br><a href="mailto:cavilaparra@worldbank.org">cavilaparra@worldbank.org</a>  |
| Support to the Barbados Economic Recovery and Transformation (BERT) programme                | Social protection component: Enhanced capacity to implement BERT through three social protection specialists, one each in the Ministry of People Empowerment and Elder Affairs, Statistical Services and the Ministry of Finance, Economic Affairs and Investment | CODI social protection assessment to identify bottlenecks in social protection system, programmes and service delivery and provide recommendations for further action           | Caribbean Development Bank   | Ministry of People Empowerment and Elder Affairs; Statistical Services; Ministry of Finance, Economic Affairs and Investment  | Part of 150,000,000 loan to support the implementation of the BERT                   | Anthony George,<br><a href="mailto:georgea@caribank.org">georgea@caribank.org</a>  |
| Enhancing resilience in Education, Child Protection and Psychosocial Protection in the CDEMA | 1) Develop model guidelines identifying core elements for national level implementation of a sustainable shock-responsive system, including national  | Output 3: Implementation of national social protection programmes is strengthened with improved management and operational tools  | CDEMA  |   | UNICEF and CSO Funds<br>1,035,676.50   | Maya Faisal<br><a href="mailto:mffaisal@unicef.org">mffaisal@unicef.org</a> and Marie-Christina Dankmeyer,<br><a href="mailto:mdankmeyer@unicef.org">mdankmeyer@unicef.org</a> |

|   |  |  |                 |   |                             |  |
|---|--|--|-----------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Participating States  | consultations and training sessions<br><br>2) Develop case studies and/or documentation to serve as guidance and “know-how” for countries to consider within their national social protection reform process and disaster preparedness   |  |                 |   |                             |  |
| Strengthened national and subnational human and institutional capacities to develop and deliver inclusive and equitable social protection systems to strengthen the resilience of & protect boys and girls from all forms of poverty and social exclusion | 1) Valid social protection strategy and/or policy that addresses children’s needs<br><br>2) Child poverty analysis reflected in Country Poverty Assessment   | Output 1: Institutional capacities strengthened for integrated service delivery through development of evidence based, gender responsive social and disaster risk management policy and legislation;<br>Output 5: Regional capacities are strengthened for adaptive social protection by engaging stakeholders for policy coherence and South-South Cooperation  | OECS Commission | Ministry of Equity, Social Justice, Empowerment, Youth Development, Sports and Local Government | UNICEF Funds<br><br>340,000 | Maya Faisal, <a href="mailto:mffaisal@unicef.org">mffaisal@unicef.org</a> and Alexandru Nartea, <a href="mailto:anartea@unicef.org">anartea@unicef.org</a> |
| Caribbean resilience Project / Technical assistance to Guyana, Saint Lucia and Dominica for a just transition to environmentally sustainable economies in the context of climate change adaptation  | 1. Increase national awareness and mainstreaming of Decent Work and social partnerships for more inclusive and comprehensive disaster preparedness and recovery processes.<br><br>2. Improve the capacity of governments, employers’ organizations and trade unions to develop and implement actions for climate change adaptation and greening of the economy.<br><br>3. Increase availability of empirical information and data, practical and suitable tools to facilitate policy development, decision-making and intervention design to support resilience. | The project builds on the experiences of hurricanes Irma and Maria and seeks to improve the integration of jobs and the Decent Work Agenda in how Caribbean labour markets prepare for, cope with and otherwise respond to climate events. The transition to ‘green jobs’ is also recognized as a crucial part of the resilience framework in the region, providing long-term environmental protection, economic development and social inclusion. By supporting the implementation of the ILO | ILO             | --  | 997,860<br><br>ILO Funds    | Ariel Pino, <a href="mailto:pino@ilo.org">pino@ilo.org</a>   |

|  |  |  |                               |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
|  |  | “Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all” labour markets will become more resilient to shocks and people may reduce the dependency on social assistance programmes  |                               |   |  |  |
| Strengthening Emergency Preparedness and Response Capacity in the Caribbean (overall programme of WFP) | <p>1. Governments have the capacity to respond to shocks through existing social protection systems and programmes.</p> <p>2. Risk-management capacities of individuals, households and communities vulnerable to shocks are strengthened through measurable improvements to social protection data management systems, beneficiary targeting, delivery mechanisms, inter-institutional coordination and disaster risk financing strategies</p> <p>3. National and regional end-to-end supply chains (from source to last-mile delivery) are strengthened for the rapid, appropriate and effective mobilization of resources, goods and services to assist disaster-affected populations</p> | Analysis, measures and strategies utilized to strengthen national social protection systems and programmes will be leveraged, adapted and tailored to achieve Joint Programme results  | WFP in partnership with CDEMA | Ministries of social protection, disaster risk management agencies, CCRIF, Academia, private sector | ECHO, DFID (via the EnGenDER project), WFP corporate 6,100,000 | Regis Chapman, <a href="mailto:regis.chapman@wfp.org">regis.chapman@wfp.org</a>      |
| Measurement of SDG 5.4.1 in CARICOM  | Explores options for measurement of SDG 5.4.1 in a way that would ensure comparability across CARICOM; and establishment of Regional Advisory Group for the Measurement of SDG 5.4.1   | Provides methodology and approach for measuring SDFG 5.4.1 through the Census and therefore addresses the concern of replicating the experience in Latin America, where different approaches to measurement of unpaid care work, prevents comparability across countries. Through this initiative, the | UN Women                      |   | \$30,000 UN Women  | Isiwa Iyehen, <a href="mailto:Isiwa.iyehen@unwomen.org">Isiwa.iyehen@unwomen.org</a> |



|  |  |   |          |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|----------|---|--|--|
|  |  | methodology for a census-based approach for measuring SDG 5.4.1 will be made available to the SDG fund initiative   |          |   |  |  |
| Supporting gender-responsive approaches and capacities for climate change and disaster recovery in the Caribbean   | Improved national mechanisms for gender-responsive and inclusive recovery in select countries through provision of technical assistance to national agencies with responsibilities in recovery   | The project's analytical work on the gender inequality of disaster and climate risk will be made available to inform interventions on shock and gender responsive social protection               | UN Women |   | \$997,920.00 UNDP  | Isiuwa Iyahun,<br><a href="mailto:Isiuwa.iyahun@unwomen.org">Isiuwa.iyahun@unwomen.org</a>           |
| Building Effective Resilience for Human Security in the Caribbean Countries:<br><br>The Imperative of Gender Equality and Women Empowerment in a Strengthened Agriculture (and related Agri/Fisheries Small Business) Sector | The project addresses unequal access to and land/business ownership; discrimination in access to resources, extension services, finance and insurance; unequal disaster and climate change proofing women's livelihoods in this sector   | The project's focus on rural women and "climate proofing" of their livelihoods will complement the SDG fund's interventions on strengthening resilience to economic, disaster and climatic shocks | UN Women | FAO, UNDP, ILO  | US\$ 6,447,930 UNTFHS  | Isiuwa Iyahun,<br><a href="mailto:Isiuwa.iyahun@unwomen.org">Isiuwa.iyahun@unwomen.org</a>           |
| Saint Lucia<br><br>Japan Caribbean Climate Change Partnership  | <u>Outcome 1:</u> Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) to promote alternative low-emission and climate-resilient technologies<br><br><u>Outcome 2:</u> Adoption and implementation of mitigation and adaptation technologies<br><br><u>Outcome 3:</u> Strengthened knowledge networks through shared South-South and North-South experiences | 13.1, 13.2, 13.b. 17.18   | UNDP     | UNDP Sub-regional Office for Barbados and the OECS, UNDP country Offices Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname | 15,000,000 Total for the regional programme<br><br>Government of Japan | <u>Sherri Frederick,</u><br><a href="mailto:Sherri.frederick@undp.org">Sherri.frederick@undp.org</a> |
| Saint Lucia<br><br>EnGender  | *Improved capacity for gender-responsive climate change adaptation and mitigation planning and implementation  | 13.1, 13.2, 13.b  | UNDP     | UNW, WFP, CDEMA   | 15 million total for regional programme – the project was recently     | <u>Danielle Evanson,</u><br><a href="mailto:Danielle.evanson@undp.org">Danielle.evanson@undp.org</a> |

|   |   |                                       |       |   |  |   |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------|---|--|---|
|   | <p>among state and non-government actors</p> <p>*Improved integrated recovery planning and frameworks at the national and regional levels for gender-responsive and resilient disaster recovery by key vulnerable groups</p> <p>*Increased application of gender-responsive and rights-based approaches by national CC and DRR decision making bodies</p>   |                                       |       |   | <p>launched and so individual country programmes and corresponding budgets are being determined</p> <p>Government of Canada main donor, DFID secondary donor</p> |   |
| <p>Saint Lucia</p> <p>Strengthen integrated and cohesive preparedness capacity at a community, national and regional level in the Caribbean</p> | <p>Strengthen national early warning systems (EWS) for preparedness in Saint Lucia ensuring integration of a gender equality approach</p>   | 13.1                                  | CDEMA | <p>Implementing Partner: UNDP</p> <p>Responsible Parties: IFRC</p>  | <p>Total Project Funding: \$1,769,174</p> <p>Saint Lucia Implementation Budget: \$88,666</p> <p>Funding source: DG-ECHO</p>                                      | <p>Alexcia Cooke, <a href="mailto:Alexcia.Cooke@cdema.org">Alexcia.Cooke@cdema.org</a></p> <p>Almudena Montoliu, UNDP Regional Coordinator <a href="mailto:almudena.montoliu@undp.org">almudena.montoliu@undp.org</a></p> |
| <p>Saint Lucia</p> <p>CariSecure</p>  | <p>OUTPUT 1: Standardized and disaggregated crime data reporting within and among national authorities to foster the reliance on valid, reliable, and comparable data on citizen security.</p> <p>OUTPUT 2: Reliance on evidence-based analysis of crime and violence data to inform national citizen security policy making.</p> <p>OUTPUT 3: Targeted policymaking to reduce likelihood of youth involvement in crime and violence, based on valid, reliable, and comparable evidence at all levels</p> | Use of data to inform decision-making | UNDP  | <p>Implementing Partner: Saint Lucia Department of Economic Development, Transport and Civil Aviation</p> <p>Working closely with ministries responsible for National Security, Social Transformation and Youth Development</p> <p>CARICOM</p> <p>UWI</p> | <p>Total regional budget \$14 million</p> <p>Total sub-regional project budget \$8.78 million</p> <p>USAID Funded</p>  | <p><a href="mailto:oswald.alleyne@undp.org">Oswald Alleyne, oswald.alleyne@undp.org</a></p>   |
| <p>Barbados</p> <p>Disaster Risk and Energy Management (DREAM) project</p>  | <p>Project objective: Promotion of increased access to clean energy in Barbados through solar photo-voltaic systems in government buildings to strengthen the country's climate resilience and disaster risk management</p> <p>Component 1: Renewable energy policy framework</p>   | 13.1                                  | UNDP  | <p>Barbados Government Department of Energy and Telecommunications</p>  | <p>\$1, 726, 484</p> <p>GEF Funded</p>   | <p><a href="mailto:Destine.Gay@undp.org">Destine Gay, destine.gay@undp.org</a></p>  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | Component 2. Clean energy capacity development<br>Component 3. Solar photovoltaic system installations |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

# Annex 11: Preliminary Stakeholder Analysis

| Stakeholders   | Interest and involvement in the evaluation   |
|--|--|
| <b>Internal stakeholders</b>   |  |
| <b>PUNOs multi-country offices (MCOs) in Eastern Caribbean</b>         | <b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - Responsible for the planning and implementation of the JP. The MCOs have an interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making. They are also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries and partners for performance and results the JP. The MCOs will be involved in using evaluation findings for future programmes and partnerships.   |
| <b>PUNOs Regional bureaux (RB) for Latin America and the Caribbean</b> | <b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - Responsible for both oversight of country offices and technical guidance and support, the RBs management has an interest in an independent/impartial account of operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings to apply this learning to other country offices. The RBs will be involved in the planning of the next programme, thus it is expected to use the evaluation findings to provide strategic guidance, programme support, and oversight. The WFP regional evaluation unit supports country office/regional bureau management to ensure quality, credible and useful evaluation. |
| <b>PUNOs Headquarters (HQ)</b>   | <b>Primary stakeholder</b> - PUNOs headquarters divisions are responsible for issuing and overseeing the rollout of normative guidance on corporate programme themes, activities and modalities, as well as of overarching corporate policies and strategies. They also have an interest in the lessons that emerge from evaluations, as many may have relevance beyond the geographical area of focus.  |
| <b>PUNOs Office of Evaluation (OEV)</b>                                | <b>Primary stakeholder</b> - The Offices of Evaluation have a stake in ensuring that joint evaluations deliver quality, credible and useful evaluations respecting provisions for impartiality as well as roles and accountabilities of various evaluation stakeholders as outlined in the UNEG norms and standards. They may use the evaluation findings, as appropriate, to feed into centralized evaluations, evaluation syntheses or other learning products.  |
| <b>PUNOs governing bodies</b>  | <b>Primary stakeholder</b> - the governance bodies provide final oversight of PUNOs programmes and guidance to programmes. They have an interest in being informed about the effectiveness of their programmes. This evaluation is not expected to be presented to governing bodies, but its findings may feed into thematic and/or regional syntheses and other joint and/or corporate learning processes.  |
| <b>The Office of Resident Coordinator</b>                              | <b>Primary stakeholder</b> - The RC is responsible and accountable for the development, strategic planning and oversight of the joint programmes funded by the Joint SDG Fund. The RC coordinates the conceptualization of the joint programmes and endorses the final proposal in coordination with the relevant PUNOs, to ensure alignment of the Joint Programme with national development priorities. The RC provides the strategic oversight of the joint programme through the local steering committees together with the PUNOs, government partners and other local stakeholders, managing implementation, monitoring, reporting, and evaluations.             |
| <b>External stakeholders</b>   |  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Beneficiaries</b></p> <p>People living in poverty and vulnerable to climate-related events and particularly women</p> | <p><b>Key informants and primary stakeholders</b> - As the ultimate recipients of assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in determining whether the JP is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought. People living in poverty and vulnerable to climate-related events are rights holders and thus both beneficiaries and stakeholders at the same time. Under the JP, particular attention was paid to the needs of women, children, and older persons directly, as well as youth, persons with disabilities and migrants indirectly where their needs are specific and in the event of shocks risk to be further left behind.</p>  |
| <p><b>Government of Barbados and St. Lucia</b></p> <p>-</p>   | <p><b>Key informants and primary stakeholder</b> - The Government of Barbados has a direct interest in knowing whether the JP activities in the country are aligned with its priorities, harmonized with the action of other partners and meet the expected results. Issues related to capacity development, handover and sustainability will be of particular interest. The evaluation is deemed to be of particular interest for the following institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of People, Empowerment and Elder Affairs (Barbados)</li> <li>- Ministry of Equity (St. Lucia)</li> <li>- National Emergency Management Organization (NEMO, St. Lucia)</li> <li>- National Insurance Corporation (St. Lucia)</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>The United Nations sub-regional team (UNST)</b></p>   | <p>The harmonized action of the UNST should contribute to the realization of the government developmental objectives. It has therefore an interest in ensuring that JP is effective in contributing to the UN concerted efforts. Various agencies are also direct partners of WFP at policy and activity level.</p>   |
|   |   |
| <p><b>SDG Fund</b></p>  | <p><b>Primary stakeholder</b> - The JP is funded by the SDG Fund that has an interest in knowing whether its funds have been spent efficiently and if PUNOs work has been effective and contributed to accelerating SDGs and advancing the UN Reform process as outlined above.</p>   |
| <p><b>World Bank</b></p>  | <p><b>Secondary stakeholder</b> - In Saint Lucia, the World Bank is undertaking a USD 20m loan for the Human Capital Resilience project. It focuses on strengthening technical and vocation education and training, as well as strengthening the social protection system and service delivery. The government values and is interested in the UN's role to bring in PUNOs' expertise from previous country engagement and strengthen elements of the social protection system in its adaptive capacity at policy and programme level, in close coordination with the responsible Ministry of Equity as the main institution responsible of the implementation of the social protection component of the Human Capital Resilience project.</p>  |
| <p><b>OECS Commission</b></p>   | <p><b>Primary stakeholder</b> - The OECS is the key partner for JP implementation at regional level. It is dedicated to economic harmonization and integration, protection of human and legal rights, and the encouragement of good governance among independent and non-independent countries in the Eastern Caribbean. This inter-governmental organization comprises Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the British Virgin Islands, and - most notably for this Joint Programme - Saint Lucia, as well as Martinique and Guadeloupe as most recent additions. It is also in the process of developing a regional Social Protection Policy with the potential to advance the sector and particularly universal and adaptive social protection across the region further, not only through the OECS Technical Working Group on Social Protection, but also via fora such as the OECS Council of Ministers on Social Development. The OECS Living Standard Measurement Committee, including country</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | national statistics office, staff from social development and economic planning ministries, also plays a critical role in establishing the criteria, timing and strategy for the monitoring of living standards and labour conditions in the OECS, and has a well-established relationship with the majority of the Joint Programme PUNOs as associated members.   |
| <b>Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)</b>                       | <b>Secondary stakeholder</b> - The CDB is further strengthening capacities of key national counterparts in Barbados through three social protection consultants in government ministries and departments. The CDB is interested in close cooperation with the Joint Programme to leverage synergies at the country's critical juncture of the BERT process. CDB is also working with the government of Saint Lucia to develop a resilience building project and response to COVID-19 to include <i>inter alia</i> digitizing of payment system for PAP beneficiaries with the possibility of scaling up to other OECS countries. CDB and the ILO are also collaborating to support the National Insurance Corporation (NIC) of Saint Lucia with unemployment insurance processes and strategies. |
| <b>Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA)</b> | <b>Secondary stakeholder</b> - CDEMA is a regional intergovernmental agency for disaster management in the Caribbean Community. With its initial responsibility for the coordination of emergency response and relief efforts to participating states requesting assistance, it now takes an integrated and proactive approach to disaster risk management and seeks to reduce the risk and loss associated with natural and technological hazards and the effects of climate change to enhance regional sustainable development. As such, the adaptive component of this JP is of particular interest in advancing this goal. CDEMA currently covers 18 Member States, including Barbados and Saint Lucia, and has well-established relationships with most of the JP partners.                 |

# Annex 12: Guiding questions on inclusion of persons with disabilities

- To what extent did the program target persons with disabilities?
  - Not specifically targeted
  - One of the groups of direct beneficiaries targeted
  - Main target group for the program
- To what extent did the design and implementation of activities of the joint program supported include disability-related accessibility and non-discrimination requirement?
  - No requirements
  - General reference
  - Specific requirements
- To what extent have persons with disabilities, in particular children and women with disabilities, been consulted through their representative organizations?
  - Not invited
  - Invited
  - Specific outreach
- To what extent did support to data collection and analysis, registries, and information system feature disability?
  - No reference to disability
  - Disability included via Washington group short set or similar but no analysis
  - Disability included via Washington group short set or similar
    - Part of general analysis
    - with specific analysis
- To which extent did the program contribute to support inclusion of persons with disabilities via:
  - Ensuring basic income security
  - Coverage of health care costs, including rehabilitation and assistive devices
  - Coverage of disability-related costs, including community support services
  - Facilitate access to inclusive early childhood development, education, and work/livelihood