

Terms of Reference (TOR) for evaluation of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) project portfolio in Guatemala

The PBF has been engaged in Guatemala for nearly four years. As the current programme winds down, the purpose of this evaluation is to assess PBF's results in a cumulative way, and to analyze its overall added value to peacebuilding in the country. The evaluation will be used for learning, accountability and to contribute to the PBF's decision-making regarding further engagement in Guatemala.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Guatemala's conflict history

More than twenty-five years after its return to civilian rule and 15 years after the signing of the UN-mediated Peace Accords, Guatemala has continued to struggle with securing the rule of law and fighting impunity. Since the signing of the Accords in 1996, violence in the country has gained traction, with some actors involved in politically-motivated violence transforming themselves into powerful "private" organised crime networks. These networks have infiltrated state institutions and have wrested territorial control from legitimate authority. Acting with impunity, and in collusion with international drug cartels and violent street gangs, these groups have dogged Guatemala's post-Accord peace process with new waves of violent crime and corruption, contributing to make Guatemala one of the most violent places in the world that is officially "at peace."

This decades-long pressure on the state has eroded its ability to combat violence and deliver justice. At the time of the initial Peacebuilding Fund allocation in 2011, less than 2% of murders in Guatemala resulted in a criminal conviction. Institutions, such as the National Civilian Police – a body created by the Peace Accords – were seen as failing to fulfil their mandates largely due to corruption and inefficiency of the justice and security institutions. The combined effect of this constant erosion of state institutions had questioned their legitimacy and threatens to push Guatemala into a failed state.

B. Overview of PBF's involvement in Guatemala

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), established in 2006, is a flexible peacebuilding tool that supports the United Nation's broader peacebuilding objectives in countries at risk of relapsing into conflict. It is intended to be a catalytic fund, driven by existing planning, coordination and monitoring mechanisms to support the peacebuilding strategies of in-country UN and Government leadership. The Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) is

responsible for the overall management of the PBF; UNDP's Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF)¹ is the Fund's Administrative Agent. At the country level, management of the Fund is delegated to a Joint Steering Committee (JSC), co-chaired by the national Government and the United Nations with a broader membership representing national and international stakeholders.

On November 15th, 2010, the UN Secretary-General declared Guatemala eligible to receive funds from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), based on the Government's request and the findings of the UNDP/BCPR-PBSO Joint Assessment Mission undertaken in June 2010. In April 2011, funding of \$10 million was announced by the PBF, in support of Guatemala's Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP), a strategic document meant to guide national decision-making on how best to implement interventions aimed at addressing peacebuilding priorities in the areas of justice and security.

The Priority Plan supports the effective implementation of the Guatemalan Peace Accords, as the best chance for human development and democratization for Guatemala. The Guatemalan government and the National Council of the Peace Accords acknowledge that the agenda of the Peace Accords has remained unfulfilled, including important aspects of the Accords related to justice and security reform. Historic causes of the conflict remain only partially addressed and, combined with the new forms of violence noted above, threaten to draw Guatemala back into renewed conflict.

Given the above, Guatemala's Peacebuilding Priority Plan sought to focus on restoring public confidence in justice and security institutions through capacity development and reform. Specifically, the PPP focused on two priorities areas with four outcomes, including:

PBF Priority Area 1: Activities designed to respond to imminent threats to the peace process, in particular in relation to strengthening of national institutions and processes set up under those agreements.

Outcome1. Technical, human, organizational capacity within the Interior Ministry ensure enhanced security, promote a culture of peace and contribute to the reduction of violence.²

¹Memorandum of Understanding between the Recipient UN Organizations and UNDP regarding the Operational Aspects of the PBF applies.

²Original language of this outcome was: "Technical and human capacity of the national police (re)built with special attention to equipping and skill training to promote strict adherence to the Constitution, discipline, civic education, professionalism and human resource management." The outcome was revised in 2013, when the Project Institutional Strengthening of the Ministry of Interior to ensure safety and promote a culture of peace" was approved by JSC to better adequate the PPP outcome to the effective results of the Project, according to the change of the national agenda in security and peace promoted by the new authorities of Ministry of Interior

Outcome 2: Judiciary system is strengthened through equipping, staffing and training of Office of the Magistrate and courts to establish credibility, professionalism, independence, and efficiency in the judiciary system and inclusive law reform in order to institute rule of law.

PBF Priority Area 2: Activities undertaken to build and/or strengthen national capacities to promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict and to carry out peacebuilding activities.

Outcome 5: National reconciliation processes focused on promotion of peace and of a culture of inclusive peaceful coexistence, as well as on resolution of conflicts, are strengthened and the most urgent human rights legacies of the conflict addressed, including responsible media.

Outcome 7: Exercising of fundamental human rights by general public improved to redress enduring practices of political and economic exclusion.

Selection of projects and oversight of their implementation sits with the Joint Steering Committee, drawn from the Government of Guatemala, the United Nations and donors.³The JSC is co-chaired by the Minister of Internal Affairs (Ministro de Gobernación) and the UN Resident Coordinator. The JSC is mandated to ensure that selected projects not only meet their stated project-level objectives, but contribute to the achievement of the strategic priorities outlined in the PPP.

This TOR outlines the work of the team of institutional consultants for an independent final evaluation of the implementation of the PBF portfolio, including project performance vis-a-vis the progress of Project Document outputs towards the priority plan outcomes, institutional arrangements among the implementing agencies as well as government stakeholders, expenditure rates, and opportunities for learning.

I. PURPOSE AND USE OF EVALUATION

After nearly four years of sustained PBF engagement in Guatemala, this evaluation presents an excellent opportunity to assess PBF's achievements in a cumulative way and its overall added value to peacebuilding in Guatemala in the areas of Security, Justice and Transitional Justice. This evaluation is timely as it will contribute not only to better

³ According to the JSC TOR, the JSC consists of Executive and Technical Committees. The Executive Committee is a high-level body co-led by the Minister of Interior and the Resident Coordinator, as well as representatives of the Attorney General, UNDP, OHCHR and UN Women. In addition, a representative from CICIG acts as adviser and a member of the Donor Dialogue Group sits as an observer. This body oversees decision-making and the monitoring/review and approval of the General Framework of the implementation of the PBF. A Technical Committee, composed of technical MINGOB, MP, OCR and different UN Agencies participating in the PBF, reviews and approves projects under the General Framework implementation of PBF.

understanding the effectiveness of PBF's strategic decision-making and overall learning about how selected projects have contributed to the overall PPP outcomes, but will help inform decision-making on the appropriateness of any continued PBF engagement beyond the current PPP.

Hence, the purpose of this evaluation is to:

- assess to what extent the entire PBF envelope of support from 2011 to 2015 has made a concrete and sustained impact in terms of building and consolidating peace in Guatemala, either through direct action or through catalytic effects;
- assess how relevant, efficient, effective and sustainable PBF support to Guatemala has been;
- assess where the critical remaining peacebuilding gaps in Guatemala are;
- assess whether the support provided by PBF has allowed a specific focus on women's access to justice and security, and whether all the peacebuilding interventions supported by PBF factored in gender equality;
- provide lessons for future PBF support internationally on key successes and challenges (both in terms of programming and in terms of management of PBF funds); and
- serve as a useful evidence-based input for decision-making on any possible future support.

There are two main clients for the evaluation, to whom the recommendations will be addressed: (i) the Guatemala PBF management team, including the Resident Coordinator's Office and the Joint Steering Committee; and (ii) PBSO/ PBF.

II. SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The evaluation will have a broad scope and will consider the overall performance of PBF support from 2011 to 2015 as a whole, as well as within individual projects.

The scope of the evaluation can be broken down into the following three components:

A. Evaluation of impact of entire PBF portfolio of support to Guatemala

The evaluation will examine the effect of the entire portfolio of projects funded under the PPP by PBF in order to assess the PBF's overall contribution to the building and consolidation of peace in Guatemala, particularly within the areas of Security, Justice and Transitional Justice.⁴

⁴ We should be clear about whether we want the entire portfolio – so including the GPI project, or just the PPP projects. I'm inclined to make this just about the PPP.

The broad questions to be answered are based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and the UN Evaluation Group standards (including those on gender mainstreaming), which have been adapted to the context at hand as follows:⁵

Relevance:

- What was the relevance of the proposed 'theory of change' for the total PBF Guatemala portfolio and the different sector interventions?
- To what extent did the PBF respond to urgent funding needs and/ or peace relevant gaps?
- To what extent did the PBF help address women's victimization during the conflict and post-conflict period, and did the theory of change addressed gender equality?

Effectiveness/ impact:

- To what extent did PBF-funded projects achieve their intended outcomes?
- To what extent did the PBF projects mainstreamed a gender dimension and supported gender-responsive peacebuilding?
- To what extent did the PBF projects complement each other and have a strategic coherence of approach?
- To what extent did the PBF-funded projects contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in the Priority Plan?

Sustainability / ownership:

- How strong is the commitment of the Government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing any unfinished activities?
- What, if any, catalytic effects did the PBF support in Guatemala have (financial and non-financial)?

Efficiency:

- How fast and responsive has the PBF been to supporting peacebuilding priorities in Guatemala?
- To what extent did PBF support take risks to achieve peacebuilding objectives, especially in areas where other donors were not ready to do so?
- How efficient was the implementation of the PBF support through the four Priority Plan projects, and how significant were the transaction costs?
- Overall, did the PBF investments provide value for money?

Gender:

- To what extent were gender considerations mainstreamed throughout the PBF support to Guatemala (both in the Priority Plan as well as within individual projects)?

Following from the overall assessment, the evaluation will assess the *relevance, effectiveness and efficiency* of PBF's total contribution to each of the four outcomes of

⁵These should be adapted and further elaborated by the Team Leader in the Inception Report. Moreover, the questions do not need to be answered one by one but used as a basis for the evaluation narrative/ conclusions.

support to Guatemala. Examples of questions to be considered under each area are provided below:⁶

Outcome1."Technical capabilities, human, organizational and technological Interior Ministry to ensure enhanced security, promote a culture of peace and contribute to the reduction of violence".

- How agile was the PBF-funded intervention in adapting and responding to national priorities and needs?
- How effective was the intervention in strengthening the capabilities of MINGOB to ensure to ensure citizen security, promote a culture of peace and contribute to the reduction of violence, including violence against women and girls?

Outcome 2: Judiciary system is strengthened through equipping, staffing and training of Office of the Magistrate and courts to establish credibility, professionalism, independence, and efficiency in the judiciary system and inclusive law reform in order to institute rule of law.

- To what extent did the PBF-funded intervention contribute to strengthening the capabilities of the General Prosecutor's Office to provide access to justice and improve the criminal investigation and prosecution in support of the fight against impunity?

Outcome 5: National reconciliation processes focused on promotion of peace and of a culture of inclusive peaceful coexistence, as well as on resolution of conflicts, are strengthened and the most urgent human rights legacies of the conflict addressed, including responsible media.

- Which legacies have been addressed by the PBF-funded intervention, in terms of gross human rights violations committed during the internal armed conflict and the process of national reconciliation?
- To what extent did the project effectively address these legacies?
- To what extent did the PBF-funded intervention addressed the widespread use of sexual violence as a weapon of war and provided support and justice to survivors?
- To what extent did the PBF-funded interventions in support of the fight against impunity of the perpetrators of gross human rights violations committed during the internal armed conflict contribute to strengthening the rule of law?

Outcome7: Exercising of fundamental human rights by general public improved to redress enduring practices of political and economic exclusion.

⁶Again, the Team Leader should adapt and elaborate on these in the Inception Report.

- To what extent did the PBF-funded intervention contribute to strengthening the institutional response to prevent and address the multiple forms violence affecting children, youth and women, including: child abuse, domestic violence, sexual violence, trafficking, etc.
- To what extent did the PBF contribute to influence the Interior Ministry in promoting the concept of citizen security with a preventive approach toward peaceful coexistence?

B. Evaluation of PBF management and oversight structures in Guatemala

The evaluation will examine the management of the PBF support in order to comment on the overall effectiveness and efficiency of arrangements both in-country and between PBSO/PBF and the UN Country Team. This should include the funding, programming and decision-making arrangements between all the actors and the quality and inclusivity of national ownership of the processes. Some of the questions to be examined by the evaluation are as follows:

Joint Steering Committee (JSC):

- How transparent, effective and efficient was the decision-making regarding the PBF support?
- How timely was the process of project approval? What were the main factors facilitating or delaying it?
- How suitable was the JSC composition to its role and how did JSC evolve over time?
- To what extent did civil society organizations participated to the JSC, including women organizations?
- How strong was the government leadership/ ownership of the JSC?
- How effective were the JSC support bodies, if any existed?
- How strategic was the selection of projects to be supported and of UN agencies (RUNOs) to implement them?
- How strong was the strategic anchorage of the PBF support and the individual projects in the national and UN frameworks for Guatemala?
- How effective was the in-country oversight of the projects by the joint steering mechanism, including quality assurance of monitoring data and reports?
- What kind of early warning systems/ risk management systems were in place, if any, and how were they used?

Implementing UN Agency (RUNO)/ UN Country Team (UNCT):

- What was the implementation capacity of the individual RUNOs and their implementing partners?
- How did different RUNOs work together towards common strategic objectives?
- What was the process for compiling half yearly and annual reviews and reports and what was the quality of those reports?
- How was gender considered throughout not only project design but also implementation, monitoring and reporting?

- Was adequate gender expertise available in the country team to support the integration of gender within the PBF-supported interventions?
- How were the principles of Do No Harm integrated in day-to-day management and oversight?

C. Key lessons learned and recommendations

The evaluation should provide an overview of key lessons and recommendations based on the assessment of the PBF support to Guatemala over the period 2011-2015. These should be addressed to PBSO as well as the PBF management in Guatemala (JSC and UNCT), and consider important entry points with key Governmental Ministries. Where possible, lessons should be made general and phrased in a way that can be used to strengthen future PBF programming in other countries. The lessons and recommendations should speak to:

- the main programming factors of success;
- the main programming challenges;
- the main implementation/ administration factors of success;
- the main implementation/ administration challenges;
- the main challenges and ways to address them.

The major lessons and recommendations should come out clearly in the evaluation Executive Summary.

III. **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY/ APPROACH**

The evaluation will be summative, and will employ, to the greatest extent possible, a participatory approach whereby discussions with and surveys of key stakeholders provide/ verify the substance of the findings. Proposals should outline a strong mixed method approach to data collection and analysis, clearly noting how various forms of evidence will be employed vis-à-vis each other to triangulate gathered information.

Evaluators should review any theories of change that either explicitly or implicitly framed the programming logic of the Priority Plan and its projects. The evaluation team should propose, where necessary, suggestions for improvement or strengthening existing theories of change or the identification of theories of change where they are absent.

PBSO encourages evaluations teams to employ innovative approaches to data collection and analysis. Proposals should be clear on the specific role each of the various methodological approaches in helping to address each of the evaluation questions. The methodologies for data collection may include but not necessarily be limited to:

- Rigorous desk review of documentation supplied by PBSO and the UN Country Team (and available through MTFO Gateway website), including: the Priority Plan, project documents, pertinent correspondence related to the initial allocation decision and subsequent project implementation, project reports,

and any other information produced by Recipient UN Organizations with respect to PBF-funded projects.

- Key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as appropriate, with major stakeholders in New York, including PBSO, MPTF-O, and key UN agencies implementing PBF support in Guatemala;
- Systematic review of monitoring data from the Recipient UN Organizations, the JSC or other key sources of data;
- On-site field visits and interviews of PBF-funded projects, where possible.
- Key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as appropriate, with all major stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries in Guatemala (including the Joint Steering Committee, UN agencies, implementing agencies, the Government, beneficiary institutions, a sample of individual beneficiaries, other development and peacebuilding partners). Beneficiaries should represent diverse groups, including women from different ethnic groups. Proposals should clearly indicate how interview and focus group discussion data will be captured, coded and analyzed.
- Survey of key stakeholders, if relevant.

IV. EVALUATION PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS

The evaluation findings will be evidence based and following the evaluation standards from OECD DAC and the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). PBSO will brief the evaluation team on quality standards.

V. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

The PBSO, through its M&E Unit, will manage and oversee the evaluation process. A Reference Group will be created to provide PBSO with advice on each of the deliverables. The Reference Group is likely to have members from the Joint Steering Committee, key in-country stakeholders, PBF management team and PBSO/PBF. Its TORs will be developed and shared with the evaluation team prior to the commencement of the assignment. The PBSO will approve each of the deliverables by the evaluation team, following internal quality assurance and consultation with the Reference Group.

The evaluation team will prepare an Inception Report to further refine the evaluation questions and detail its methodological approach, including data collection instruments. The Inception Report must be approved by the PBSO prior to commencement of the evaluation team's in-country data collection trip.

In addition, before leaving the field following in-country data collection, the evaluation team will schedule a presentation of preliminary findings with the Joint Steering Committee and UNCT with view to their validation. A separate validation exercise will be scheduled with PBSO and the Reference Group prior to the submission of the draft report.

Day to day work of the evaluation team and their logistics will be supported by PBSO, with assistance from the in-country management team and the UN Country Team. The PBSO will retain the copyright over the evaluation. The evaluation findings will be made public following final approval by the PBSO and incorporating feedback from the Country Office.

VI. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIREMENTS

While firms should propose team compositions based on their understanding of the needs of the evaluation, at a minimum, the evaluation team should consist of one senior evaluator (ideally with experience in peacebuilding evaluations), one specialist on peacebuilding programming and another specialist on the current political, justice, security and reconciliation challenges in Guatemala. At least one of the team members should have a background on gender equality and women's empowerment. The Team Leader will be responsible for the evaluation methodology, coordination of other team members, and the overall quality of and the timely submission of all the deliverables.

The Team Leader should possess the following skills and expertise, at a minimum:

- Masters degree in a relevant area including social sciences, international development, research methods, or evaluation ;
- Eight to ten years of evaluation experience, including the use of mixed methods. Ideally some evaluation experience within post-conflict countries and peacebuilding programmes;
- Demonstrated familiarity with the United Nations and its Agencies, Funds and Programmes;
- Demonstrated understanding of gender issues and women and peacebuilding within evaluation;
- Ability to plan effectively, prioritize, complete tasks quickly, adapt to changing context and demonstrated leadership in managing a team.
- Strong analytical skills, including with qualitative and quantitative research methods;
- Excellent communication skills, written and oral, including in cross-cultural contexts;
- Fluency in Spanish and English

The Peacebuilding specialist should possess the following skills and expertise, at a minimum:

- Masters degree in a relevant area including social sciences, international development, conflict studies, law, or public administration;
- Five to seven years of post-conflict/peacebuilding experience, including experience in peacebuilding programming design and implementation.
- Demonstrated understanding of conflict analysis, conflict drivers, post-conflict recovery;
- Demonstrating understanding of the governance sector, Rule of law, citizen security, justice and human rights issues.
- Demonstrated understanding of gender issues and women and peacebuilding;

- Experience in working with government officials, international development community and people recovering from conflict;
- Demonstrated familiarity with the United Nations and its Agencies, Funds and Programmes;
- Excellent communication skills, written and oral, including in cross-cultural contexts;
- Strong team work skills;
- Fluency in Spanish and English

The Guatemala specialist should possess the following skills and expertise, at a minimum:

- University degree in a relevant field, including social sciences, history, conflict studies, etc.;
- Five years to seven years of relevant work experience, including experience working in Guatemala;
- Excellent knowledge of Guatemala's cultural, political and socio-economic context with a focus on post-conflict recovery;
- Knowledge of Guatemala's governance institutions and existing contacts in those institutions, facilitating team's communication and analysis of the stakeholders/ beneficiaries of the PBF programme;
- Understanding of the following sectors: governance, rule of law, justice, citizen security, reintegration, transitional justice;
- Experience in research and analysis of data;
- Strong team work skills;
- Strong communication skills, written and oral;
- Fluency in Spanish and English

VII. BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

The total budget for this evaluation will include:

- A MINIMUM of 50 days and a MAXIMUM of 70 days of work by the Team Leader (a Research Assistant can be included in this fee), out of which up to 21 days should be in the field;
- Up to 40 days of work by each of the two specialists;
- One return ticket for each of the team members from place of residence/ current location to Guatemala (economy class), with actual cost reimbursed;
- One return ticket by the Team Leader from place of residence/ current location to New York (economy class), with actual cost reimbursed;
- Accommodation and daily allowance for the Team Leader for the days in Guatemala (US\$183 per day, total, based on Guatemala City);
- An allowance for communication, including teleconferences with New York before and after the field mission;
- Travel costs within Guatemala (some of these maybe covered by the Country Team, where possible).

The schedule of the evaluation is expected to be as follows:

TASK/ SCHEDULE	Expected start	Expected finish
-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Scoping exercise: preliminary document review, teleconferences/ meetings with New York stakeholders (PBSO, PBC, MPTF, other UN agencies) and in-country reference group, and write up of inception report for PBSO approval.	13 May 2015	27 May 2015
Field mission, including travel and interviews with all key stakeholders, beneficiaries and partners, site visits and surveys.	10 June 2015	1 July 2015
Analysis and preparation of draft report and its presentation to PBSO New York and reference group for validation	Commence during data collection	20 July 2015
Finalizing of report following comments	31 July 2015	10 August 2015

The disbursement of funding to the team will be done as follows:

The payments to the selected firm will be made in three tranches as set out below, in section VIII.

For the local consultants, payment for any reimbursables (such as travel outside of Guatemala City) will be made up front, following the signing of the contract. The payment for the professional fees will be made following the end of the engagement, following a submission by the local consultant of the total days worked and a sign off by the Team Leader.

VIII. KEY EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Team Leader is responsible for the timely provision and quality of all evaluation deliverables. Their approval will be based on OECD DAC and UNEG standards for evaluations, tailored for the specific purposes of peacebuilding evaluations. Required language for each deliverable is noted in the schedule below. Please note that the scoping mission and validation exercise with PBSO in New York will be conducted in English.

Deliverable ⁷	Content	Due	Percentage of payment
Inception report (Spanish)	The inception report will have a maximum of 20pages and include: - the evaluation team's understanding of the TORs and any data or other concerns	27 May 2015	20%

⁷ Upon approval of the Peacebuilding Support Office.

	<p>arising from the provided materials and initial meetings/ interviews and strategies for how to address perceived shortcomings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key evaluation questions and methodological tools for answering each question; - list of key risks and risk management strategies for the evaluation; - stakeholder analysis - proposed work plan for the field mission; - table of contents for the evaluation report. <p>The Report will be approved by PBSO and receive Reference Group endorsement prior to consultants' field travel.</p>		
Presentation of preliminary results and aide memoire (Spanish)	<p>The aide memoire will have a maximum of 5 pages and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a brief summary of the purpose of the evaluation; - an overview of the mission, including activities assessed and stakeholders consulted; - an overview of preliminary findings and lessons; - an explanation of next steps. <p>The aide memoire will be presented to the Joint Steering Committee and UNCT in the last week of the field mission.</p>	1 July 2015	50%
Draft report (Spanish and English)	<p>The draft report will have a maximum of 40 pages, inclusive of an Executive Summary and annexes. The draft report should include individual project evaluation summaries as annexes that will not be counted against the total page count.</p> <p>The draft report will be reviewed by the PBSO and the Reference Group. PBSO will provide a consolidated matrix of comments which should be formally addressed in the final report.</p>	20 July 2015	
Final report (Spanish and English)	<p>The final report will have a maximum of 40 pages plus Executive summary, title page and annexes.</p> <p>The Team Leader will be responsible for</p>	10 August 2015	30%

	<p>ensuring that comments from the PBSO and the Reference Group and formally addressed.</p> <p>The final report will include all the annexes, including project evaluation summaries. It will also have a five-page Executive Summary outlining key findings on successes and 'challenges of PBF support, and recommendations, which can be used as a stand-alone document.</p> <p>The final report will be evidence based and will respond to all the questions in the Inception Report with clear and succinct lessons learned and targeted recommendations. The PBSO will approve the final report, following consultation with the Reference Group.</p> <p>Following acceptance of the final report, PBSO will coordinate a management response to the evaluation report as a separate document.</p>		
--	--	--	--