

UN-REDD
PROGRAMME



Terms of Reference for Investigation and Mid-term Evaluation of the UN-REDD Panama National Programme

[UN-REDD Programme](#)

11 April 2013

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the policies and procedures of the UN-REDD agencies (FAO, UNDP and UNEP) and the quality assurance framework of the UN-REDD Programme, a mid-term evaluation of the UN-REDD Panama National Programme (NP) implemented through the National Authority of the Environment (ANAM) is to be undertaken in 2013. The NP began in 2009 and is in its 3th year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term evaluation.

NP Title:	UN REDD Panama Programme			
		NP financing	<i>at approval (Million US\$)</i>	<i>Funds disbursed at MTR (Million US\$)</i>
		UN-REDD financing:	5,300,000.00	3,419,720.00
Country:	Panama	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:		
Executing Agency:	FAO, UNEP, UNDP	Total in cash:	5,300,000.00	3,419,720.00
National Implementing Partner :	ANAM (National Authority of the Environment)	NPD Signature (date NP began):		October 27, 2010
			Planned closing date: Jan 2014	Revised closing date: December 2014

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 UN-REDD Panama National Programme

The Objective of the UN-REDD Panama National Programme is to “assist the Government of Panama in developing an effective REDD regime”. This will contribute to the broader goal of ensuring that, by the end of 2013, Panama will be REDD-ready and will have the capacity to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation nationally.

The UN-REDD Panama National Programme will develop capacities to enable the country to be ready to implement activities that reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation by end of 2013. The National Coordination Entity of Indigenous Peoples of Panama (COONAPIP), in consultation with the authorities of indigenous peoples, has played an important role in the formulation of this joint program.

The executing arrangements for the NP are outlined in the Programme Document, available through Annex 1.

2.2 Overview of UN-REDD Panama National Programme

The following is a summary description of design and implementation milestones of the UN-REDD Panama National Programme.

- June 2009: UN-REDD Policy Board invites Panama to submit its National Programme for inter-sessional consideration
- Sept 2009: NJP document developed in collaboration among UN agencies, ANAM and COONAPIP
- Oct 2009: Validation meeting held
- Oct 2009: Budget allocation approved by UN-REDD Policy Board
- Oct 2010: National Programme Document signed by Government of Panama and UN agencies
- Dec 2010: Funds for 2011 transferred from the MDTF to the UN-REDD agencies
- July 2011: Recruitment of NP coordinator and project management unit team initiated.
- Aug 2011: Updating of workplans finalized; Activities begin on components 1 and 2 of National Programme Document results framework
- Mar 2012: Steering Committee established and first meeting held. 2012 work plan approved and implementation officially begins.
- June 2012: First letter of complaint sent from COONAPIP to UN-REDD
- Aug 2012: High Level Commission established to address conflict between COONAPIP and UN-REDD Panama National Programme regarding transfer of funds to COONAPIP and implementation modalities. Technical Committee established to advance discussions.
- Sept-Feb 2012: The Technical Commission meets four times.
- Feb 2013: COONAPIP issues a Resolution announcing its withdrawal from the UN-REDD process in Panama citing violations of indigenous peoples' rights, and communicates this decision to the RC and General Administrator of ANAM
- Mar 2013: All new activities of the UN-REDD Panama National Programme suspended pending independent investigation and evaluation of NP

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND MID-TERM EVALUATION

The objectives of the Investigation and Mid-term Evaluation are (1) to investigate complaints raised by COONAPIP against the UN-REDD Panama National Programme; (2) to thoroughly assess the implementation of the National Programme from time of approval to mid-term, with a special focus on issues of stakeholder engagement; and (3) to provide guidance and recommendations for future implementation of the National Programme and corrective action that should be taken to address COONAPIP's concerns

Among other things, the investigation will assess each of the allegations and complaints raised by COONAPIP. The Mid-Term evaluation will identify potential NP design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UN-REDD NPs), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the NP. The evaluation will assess early signs of NP success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. NP performance will be measured based on the indicators of the National Programme Document results framework/monitoring framework (see National Programme Document, available through Annex 1).

The investigation and evaluation must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with national counterparts, in particular the national REDD+ focal point, the National Authority of the Environment (ANAM) as implementing entity, UNDP Country Office, NP team, UNDP Regional Technical Adviser based in the region, the Office of the Resident Coordinator, FAO, UNEP and key stakeholders. The evaluation team is expected to conduct a field mission to Panama. The evaluation team should make efforts to interview the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. COONAPIP
2. Other NP stakeholders, to be determined at the inception meeting (e.g. national NGOs and other civil society organizations, other representatives of indigenous peoples including Panama's Indigenous Congresses, local government etc.)
3. Government representatives (including but not limited to senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area)
4. The NP Coordinator and NP team
5. UN staff with responsibilities under UN-REDD Panama National Programme, including the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator
6. Other relevant organizations and individuals

The evaluation team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the NP document, NP reports (including semi-annual and annual reports), NP budget revisions, progress reports, NP files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluation team considers useful for this evidence-based investigation and evaluation. A list of relevant documents can be found in and accessed via Annex 1.

The Investigation and Mid-term Evaluation will consist of two parts:

- i) An independent investigation into complaints and allegations made against the UN-REDD Panama National Programme; and
- ii) An evaluation of the UN-REDD Panama National Programme.

4. SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO COMPLAINTS MADE AGAINST THE UN-REDD PANAMA NATIONAL PROGRAMME

4.1 The evaluation team will review all engagement efforts and communications between COONAPIP and the UN-REDD Programme, with the aim of assessing each of the concerns and complaints raised by COONAPIP. The focus of this component of the evaluation will be to assess the validity, relevance and significance of the concerns and complaints COONAPIP has raised, in the context of UN-REDD global and national goals, commitments and process requirements. The concerns and complaints to be assessed include but are not limited to those outlined in Annex 2. The complete set of correspondence can be accessed through Annex 1.

4.2 The evaluation team will identify on the relevant UN-REDD reference documents for assessing the relevance and significance of COONAPIP's concerns and complaints, drawing particularly on the 2009 Joint Program Document (and the policies and standards identified therein, including the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) and any other agreements made by the UN-REDD Programme in Panama. Specifically, with regard to agreements made and actions taken by the UN-REDD Programme in Panama, the Evaluator will assess the following (with allowance for other issues identified by the Evaluator):

- a) Adequacy and appropriateness, including cultural appropriateness, of public consultations with the range of stakeholders, for planning and implementation of this project.
- b) Appropriateness of steps taken to include COONAPIP in the implementation and management of the NP and to make provision for building COONAPIP's own capacity.

- c) Establishment of appropriate channels and modes of communication with the indigenous peoples communities.

4.3 The evaluation team will interview any source able to assist in assessing the nature and validity of the claims and/or the reasons for any breakdown in collaboration; and will request documents from stakeholders to assist in the evaluation.

4.4 The evaluation team will prepare a draft report that outlines:

- a) The process and methodology undertaken during the evaluation, including documents reviewed and people interviewed;
- b) Assessment of the nature and validity of the concerns and complaints raised by COONAPIP, including any outstanding questions due to lack of available information; and
- c) Recommendations to address the concerns and complaints.

5. SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF UN-REDD PANAMA NATIONAL PROGRAMME

In addition to the investigation component, the evaluation team will assess the NP under following categories. For each category listed below, the evaluation team will rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex 3, and provide analysis and recommendation. Given the nature of the complaints made against the UN-REDD Panama National Programme, items 5.4 and 5.6 below should be given particular attention.

5.1 Progress towards Results

NP design:

- Review the problem addressed by the NP and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the NP.
- Review the relevance of the NP strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the NP addresses country priorities.
- Review the baseline data included in the NP results framework and suggest revisions as necessary.
- Provide suggestions to improve the design of future National Programme Documents.

Progress:

- Assess the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the NP.
- Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the NP outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.

5.2 Adaptive management

Work Planning

- Assess whether work planning processes are result-based. If not, suggest ways to reorient work planning to focus on results.
- Examine the use of the NP document results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since the NP started. Ensure any revisions meet UN-REDD requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on NP management.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the NP, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

- Review budget management and decision making, including: problems that have arisen in the budget-making process; the process for developing the NP budget, and the involvement of partners in this; and the criteria used to decide on budget allocation.

Monitoring Systems

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
- Review the latest semi-annual or annual report as appropriate and comment on progress made, quality of the submission, and overall quality of reporting to the UN-REDD Programme.
- Examine the financial management of the NP monitoring and evaluation budget, including sufficiency of resources allocated, and effectiveness of resource allocation and use.

Risk Management

- Validate whether the risks identified in the NP document and semi-annual and annual reports are the most important and up to date. If not, explain why. Give particular attention to critical risks.
- Describe additional risks identified and suggest possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by NP management and shared with PEB.
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Problem Solving

- Assess the processes in place for addressing problems as they arise, and their effectiveness at addressing problems satisfactorily.

5.3 Management arrangements

- Review overall effectiveness of NP management as outlined in the NP document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the NP Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by UN-REDD agencies and recommend areas for improvement.

Management Performance

- Assess the process by which workplans were designed and developed, and the involvement of partners in this process.
- Assess the ability of work plans to address the needs of the NP.
- Assess the timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and outputs and their impact on project operations and relations with project partners.

Personnel

- Assess the procedures by which project staff members were selected.
- Assess the clarity and appropriateness of lines of authority and reporting for the Programme Manager and other project staff.
- Assess whether the TORs of the Programme Manager and other project staff adequately address the needs of the NP.
- Assess how personnel performance reviews are conducted and the outcomes of performance reviews of the Programme Manager and other project staff.

5.4 Governance

Steering Committee and Other Decision-making Bodies

- Assess the representation of stakeholders on the Steering Committee and other decision-making bodies and the criteria for their selection.
- Assess whether the current representation at the Steering Committee meets the Programme needs. If not, suggest changes that should be made.

5.5 Coordination for Joint Delivery

- Assess coordination mechanisms and decisions taken:
 - a) among agencies, government, and relevant stakeholders including IPs and CSOs to ensure the successful delivery of the NP;
 - b) between the government and UN agencies to ensure programme outcomes are achieved;
 - c) between FAO, UNEP and UNDP to ensure joint delivery;
 - d) within and between government ministries in order to ensure programme outcomes are achieved;
 - e) between the NP and other bilateral and multilateral REDD+ initiatives.
- Assess the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by the UN agencies.
- Investigate whether inter-agency collaboration has helped or hindered the implementation of the National Programme.
- Assess the respective roles of the RC, RTAs, and other technical advisors in the delivery of the NP.

5.6 Stakeholder Engagement

History of Engagement with Stakeholders

- Develop a chronology of engagement with stakeholders
- Assess the process for identifying and engaging with relevant stakeholders (including IPs in particular)
- Investigate whether agreements made with NP partners and stakeholders have been followed through on in a timely manner and if not, investigate why not.

Stakeholder Representation

- Assess the basis for decisions regarding representation of IPs and other relevant national stakeholders.
- Assess the adequacy of current IP representation to ensure that IPs are adequately represented.
- Investigate whether any stakeholder groups that should be engaged in the NP are not currently represented.

Stakeholder Participation

- Assess whether relevant stakeholders, including the key partner COONAPIP, other IP groups and other relevant national stakeholders, are sufficiently involved in decision-making processes, including the design and review of work.
- Assess whether IPs and other relevant national stakeholders are sufficiently capacitated to participate effectively in the implementation of the NP.
- Assess the role and performance of ANAM in engaging with stakeholders.

Communication with Stakeholders

- Assess the communication of the NP with IPs and other stakeholders.
- Examine the process by which these mechanisms and channels of communication have been developed.
- Assess the adequacy of these communication channels.

6. INVESTIGATION AND MID-TERM EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The investigation and mid-term evaluation will be conducted by two or three independent consultants. One of these will be responsible for the investigation and associated deliverables, and one will be responsible for the mid-term evaluation and associated deliverables. While the consultants will carry out two separate tasks, because of the mutual relevance of the tasks and the efficiency gains from information exchange, they will consult one another and share information while ultimately delivering two separate documents that will make up the Final Report. Findings and recommendations should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the Final Report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned¹. Analysis leading to

¹ Individuals should not be mentioned by name if anonymity needs to be preserved. In such cases sources can be expressed in generic term (Government, NGO, donor etc.).

evaluative judgements will be clearly elaborated. The limitations of the methodological framework should also be presented in the Final Report.

The Final Report of the Investigation and Mid-term Evaluation will consist of two clear and distinct documents. The first will provide the results of the investigation into complaints made by COONAPIP against the UN-REDD Panama National Programme, as outlined in Section 4 of this TOR. The second document will provide the results of the evaluation of NP in accordance with the scope outlines in Section 5 of this TOR.

The evaluation document of the Final Report will assess the NP with respect to a minimum set of evaluation criteria using the rating scale in Annex 3. The evaluation will also provide an analysis of the NP's performance in the categories listed above, and provide recommendations for improving performance.

The investigation and evaluation will go beyond an assessment of where the NP currently stands to include analysis of *why* the NP stands where it does. This should provide the basis for recommendations that will be made in the Final Report.

7. INVESTIGATION AND MID-TERM EVALUATION PROVISIONAL TIMELINE & DELIVERABLES

Activity	Timeframe
Final TOR produced	April 12, 2013
TOR posted online for recruitment of evaluation team	April 12-21, 2013
Identification of evaluation team by the Social and Environmental Compliance Review Unit of UNDP's Office of Audit and Investigation	April 26, 2013
Review of relevant documents and preparation of Inception Report by evaluation team	May 6-13, 2013
Approval of Inception Report	May 20, 2013
Mission to Panama by the evaluation team	May 21-June 4, 2013
Interim Report produced	June 6, 2013
Draft Final Report produced	June 11, 2013
Comment period on Draft Final Report	June 11-18, 2013
Final Report produced	June 24, 2013
Presentation of Final Report at PB meeting	June 24-28, 2013

Inception Report

The Inception Report should outline the evaluation team's interpretation of the terms of reference and describe the timing and methodology the evaluation team intends to apply. The Inception Report will define the scope, design and associated technical instruments as well as a specific implementation plan. The Inception Report will include an evaluation matrix outlining all of the channels of enquiry the evaluation team intends to pursue. The purpose of the Inception Report is demonstrate the evaluation team's interpretation of the terms of reference, and to come to a basic agreement with the commissioning programme unit on how the evaluation will be conducted, how the contribution to the achievement of outcomes will be ascertained, and what the final product will look like.

Interim Report

After the mission, the evaluation team will produce an interim report outlining its preliminary findings. This may form the basis of a stakeholder briefing of the preliminary findings of the evaluation.

Final Report

The Final Report will contain two clear and distinct documents:

1. A report on the findings of the investigation into concerns and complaints raised by COONAPIP as outlined in Section 4 of this TOR; and
2. A report on the evaluation of the NP as outlined in Section 5 of this TOR.

The investigation component of the Final Report will describe the analysis and conclusions of the evaluation team with respect to the investigation into complaints made against the UN-REDD Programme in Panama, and offer recommendations for steps that might be taken to address the issues identified.

The evaluation component of the Final Report will address each of the evaluation areas outlined in Section 5: Scope of the Evaluation. Supporting data and analysis will be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. Recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

8. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The Evaluation Team carrying out the Investigation and Mid-term Evaluation will consist of two or three evaluators, one of whom will be responsible for the investigation and associated deliverables, and one of whom will be responsible for the evaluation and associated deliverables. Although carrying out two distinct tasks, due to the mutual relevance of the tasks, the consultants should consult one another and share information, while ultimately delivering two distinct products.

The Evaluation Team will be recruited based on the requirements outlined in Annex 4. The selection of the Evaluation Team will be undertaken by the Social and Environmental Compliance Unit of UNDP's Office of Audit and Investigation.

The evaluators will not have participated in the NP preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with NP related activities. The team should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects/programmes. The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the Panama UN-REDD National Programme. Knowledge of the country, good technical understanding of the REDD+ field, stakeholder engagement and consultation, as well as competence and skills in evaluation will be required. To the extent possible the Evaluation Team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation and producing the deliverables. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs. All members of the Evaluation Team will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form (Annex 5).

Annex 1: List of relevant documents and correspondence (with links)

The following documents are all available on the UN-REDD Workspace by clicking on the following link:

http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=2987&Itemid=53

I. Documents related to the Panama National Programme

1. Signed NP Document (in Spanish):
2. NP Document Approved by Policy Board (English translation)
3. UN-REDD page at the MPTF with current information on transfers
4. 2010 report presented to the Policy Board
5. 2011 Semi-annual report presented to the Policy Board
6. 2011 annual report presented to the Policy Board
7. 2012 Semi-annual report presented to the Policy Board
8. 2012 annual report (draft only available in Spanish only)

II. Documents related to COONAPIP Feb – March 2013

1. UN Letter to COONAPIP PNUD-PA-2013-01294, dated Feb 25 (original in Spanish and English Translation)
2. COONAPIP Communique of Withdrawal 31-13, dated Feb 27 (original in Spanish and English Translation)
3. COONAPIP Resolution #2-2013, dated Feb 25 (original in Spanish and English Translation)
4. COONAPIP Reply to UN Letter 32-13, dated Mar 1 (original in Spanish and English Translation)
5. UN reply to COONAPIP dated March 8, sent March 14 (original in Spanish only)
6. Letter 065-13 from COONAPIP dated March 25 (original in Spanish, English translation)

III. Documents related to COONAPIP 2012

1. Letter from COONAPIP dated June 20, 2012 (original in Spanish, English translation)
2. UN Reply to COONAPIP dated August 8, 2012
3. Steering Committee Meeting minutes (3) – March 2012; August 2012
4. Minutes of the High level Commission meeting (ANAM, COONAPIP; UN) – September 2012
5. Participants at the High level Commission meeting
6. Minutes of the Technical Committee meetings (3) – 24th September 2012; 28th September 2012; October 2012.

Annex 2: List of key complaints made by COONAPIP against the UN-REDD Programme in Panama

The full texts of these letters and correspondence are available on the UN-REDD Workspace via the following link: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=2987&Itemid=53

a) Letter from COONAPIP to UN-REDD Panama and the National Environment Authority (ANAM); 20 June 2012

- i. UN-REDD and ANAM have not designated any counterpart to work with the commission, which has made it impossible to continue work. Instead, ANAM officials have made various attempts to meet Traditional Authorities separately and try to negotiate outside the framework of COONAPIP, which is totally improper.
- ii. 29 months have gone by since this process first started and we have seen no progress and no financial resources have been made available to carry out activities in our territories and communities. Nor have we seen good will and good faith on the part of UN-REDD; and even less from ANAM, the government entity responsible for the process of preparing the REDD+ strategy in the Republic of Panama in coordination with the Indigenous Peoples.
- iii. The process initiated by UN-REDD and ANAM has been riddled with incongruences and inconsistencies both with regards to the content of the proposed documents (R-PP) and the process itself.
- iv. UN-REDD+ and ANAM have failed to understand that COONAPIP is the political representative of the Indigenous People and a facilitating body, and not merely an implementing agency.
- v. As COONAPIP we feel used in this process. We do not understand how it is possible that the United Nations— as the promoter and disseminator of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other initiatives to support Indigenous Peoples— can act in ways that are so inconsistent with these principles in its treatment of the Indigenous Peoples of Panama.
- vi. The mechanisms that UN-REDD and ANAM have used to strengthen our institution are not appropriate. The way they have acted with COONAPIP has generated confusion and inconformity in the indigenous communities and is an assault on principles and aspirations of our peoples, and their desire to seek unity and consolidate their efforts.
- vii. The annual plan that UN-REDD and ANAM presented in April in no way reflects the agreement they had made to provide \$1.79 [million] to strengthen COONAPIP and implement the PEIP.
- viii. Informality and lack of transparency have been constants in the way UN-REDD and the ANAM have behaved in this process. To this date we COONAPIP has been unable to sign the agreement with these organizations that was negotiated and agreed in September, 2011.

b) COONAPIP RESOLUTION No. 2-2013; February 25, 2013

- i. [UN-REDD Programme/ANAM – Panama's] implementation to date does not take into account the minimum standards on the human rights of Indigenous Peoples of Panama, and because the agreements contracted in the framework of the adoption of said programme have been breached.
- ii. ...note was taken of the intention of UN officials and the Panamanian government to marginalize the collective participation of the seven Indigenous Peoples and the twelve traditional structures of the Indigenous Peoples that comprise the COONAPIP; who, acting in good faith, trusted and supported the United Nations [with the hope that] the UN-REDD Programme – Panama in its preparatory phase would be accepted and implemented with the full and effective participation of the COONAPIP.
- iii. ...bad faith is patent in the legal and administrative obstacles [used] to postpone and avoid the full compliance with the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Political Advocacy of the COONAPIP (PEIP), which guarantees safeguards for the Indigenous Peoples of Panama and [respect for their] free, prior and informed consent enshrined in the national laws in force; and

[furthermore] that it is the obligation of the States and the United Nations to remove or overcome such obstacles.

- iv. To make sure that UN agencies and their staff, which have the legal obligation to respect the UN declaration on indigenous peoples do not mock them.
- v. ...[there are no] clear signs of a serious commitment to build a relationship of cooperation, nor political will to address the rights of Indigenous Peoples and [their] full and effective participation in the various phases of implementation, and that the COONAPIP therefore declares that this dialogue has failed in both content, form and participation.

c) Note No. COONAPIP/31-13; February 27, 2013

- i. [The UN-REDD Programme] does not currently offer guarantees for respecting indigenous rights [nor for] the full and effective participation of the Indigenous Peoples of Panama in all phases and in the implementation of said programme.

d) Note COONAPIP 32/13 (March 1st, 2013)

- i. The UN crudely, misleadingly and irresponsibly used COONAPIP and abused our good faith with the solely intention of approving its programme.
- ii. The latest UN-REDD letter [to COONAPIP] again shows the lack of will and the intention to subjugate IPs
- iii. Your last letter [from UN-REDD to COONAPIP] shows your intention to divide IPs at all costs

e) Public Letter/COONAPIP/065-13; March 25, 2013

- i. ...given the violation of our human rights ... as well as the discriminatory acts that we were subjected to by the UN agencies and the Government of Panama, and by their officials...
- ii. United Nations officials have taken it upon themselves to incite and subdue some of the leaders of the indigenous peoples, under the pretext of supporting them with programs and projects directly financed by the various United Nations agencies.
- iii. ...the facts demonstrate clear interference and manipulation of some indigenous leaders, in order to undermine the unity of the indigenous peoples gathered in COONAPIP, and to try to weaken us. We hold the officials related to the joint UNREDD/ANAM-PANAMA program of the United Nations, fully accountable for attempting against the unity of the indigenous peoples of Panama.

Annex 3: Evaluation Rating Scale

Progress towards results: use the following rating scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	NP is expected to achieve or exceed all its major objectives, and yield substantial benefits, without major shortcomings. The NP can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	NP is expected to achieve most of its major objectives, and yield satisfactory benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	NP is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. NP is expected not to achieve some of its major objectives or yield some of the expected benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	NP is expected to achieve its major objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	NP is expected not to achieve most of its major objectives or to yield any satisfactory benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The NP has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The NP has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	The NP has minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The NP has moderate shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The NP has significant shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The NP has major shortcomings.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The NP has severe shortcomings.

Annex 4: Recruitment of the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team will consist of two or three individuals, one of whom will assume overall responsibility for the investigation, and one of whom will assume overall responsibility for the evaluation. The consultants should have as many of the competencies outlined below as possible:

Consultants for the investigation:

- Experience in complaint assessment and conflict resolution in development projects
- A track record of credibility and impartiality in complaint handling
- Knowledge of the substantive issues (particularly indigenous peoples' rights, but also helpful to be familiar with the UNDRIP, the scope of REDD+ readiness, and/or Panama)
- Experience with indigenous peoples issues in Latin America and elsewhere
- Experience in engaging directly with Panama's Indigenous Congresses
- Experience in stakeholder engagement

Consultants for the evaluation:

- Strong experience in conducting independent evaluations and/or facilitation of complaint management for development projects
- A track record of credibility and impartiality in programme evaluation
- Knowledge of the substantive issues (particularly indigenous peoples rights, but also helpful to be familiar with the UNDRIP, the scope of REDD+ readiness, and/or Panama)
- Knowledge of REDD+, UN-REDD and multi-stakeholder forest management
- Experience in stakeholder engagement
- Knowledge of the UN system an asset

All Evaluation Team members:

- Demonstrated skill in integrating document- and interview-based assessment and evaluation
- Excellent verbal and written command of English and Spanish
- No known conflicts of interest, and willingness to disclose all associations with any Panama REDD+ stakeholders – All Evaluation Team members will be required to disclose all current and past relationships with any of the stakeholders
- Good regional knowledge of Central America
- Immediate availability to undertake the Investigation and Mid-term Evaluation including travel to Panama

Interested applicants are invited to submit an application to un-redd@un-redd.org referencing "Panama evaluation" in the subject line by 23 April 2013. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English or Spanish with indication of the email and phone contact. The application should also include the candidate's daily rate for the assignment. Participating UN organizations apply a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities, including indigenous peoples, are encouraged to apply.

Annex 5: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form²

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at place on date

Signature: _____

²www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct