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| **Place:** | Tegucigalpa, Honduras and home based |
| **Application end date:** | 23 February 2018 |
| **Type of contract:** | Individual contract |
| **Position level:** | International consultant |
| **Languages required:** | Spanish and English. |
| **Initial date:** | 05 March 2018 |
| **Contract length:** | 4 weeks |

1. **BACKGROUND**

The project was initiated in 2011, and focused on strengthening the electoral administration (component #1) and the citizen identification management (component #2). It has been funded through a multi-subject grant provided by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Other subjects (components) covered by this grant, that will not be part of this evaluation, where civic and political engagement, and citizen security.

In accordance with the National Constitution, the organization of elections in Honduras falls under the responsibility of the Supreme Electoral Tribunal (TSE) which is an autonomous institution integrated by a Board of Magistrates (three *propietarios* and one *suplente*) who are proposed by political parties and appointed by the National Congress for a five-year term, an Electoral Director, and several operational departments, units, and services[[1]](#footnote-2).

Regarding citizen identification management, the National Register of People (RNP) has the responsibility to ensure that all Hondurans have access to their identification documents and related services. RNP has offices (298) in all the municipalities around the country.

During the life-span of this project, UNDP supported the national authorities (TSE and RNP) in the organization of four elections, including 2012 primary elections, 2013 general elections, 2017 primary elections, and 2017 general elections. The extent of support and UNDP’s involvement during such elections varied according to the context and agreements with TSE, RNP, and USAID. The main areas of support by component were:

* **Electoral administration component:** 
  1. Adoption of good practices to improve the management of electoral staff and electoral projects, including competency-based approaches for the recruitment of electoral trainers and online systems for electoral staff registration. Also, the Project facilitated technical visits to the Dominican Republic and Costa Rica for this purpose.
  2. Support to the elaboration and adoption of legal instruments, such as the new by-law to promote women’s political participation and the new law to enhance political financing oversight.
  3. Specialized training on electoral administration and gender using the BRIDGE methodology, and hands-on trainings on project management, monitoring and evaluation (internal evaluation of 2017 primary elections). Also, the Project contributed to the organization of a BRIDGE workshop addressed to some Civil Society organizations to strengthen their technical capacities on elections monitoring.
  4. Support to the elaboration of training materials and voter education tools.
  5. Procurement of state-of-the-art computer equipment and software to improve TSE’s Data Center capabilities. These are usually used for network monitoring, additional storage of tally sheet images for political parties, and operational contingency. The transmission and processing of electoral results are outsourced to a third party.
  6. Logistics support for the updating of the electoral cartography and other field processes.
* **Citizen identification component:**
  1. Adoption of good practices for the management and protection of RNP’s databases.
  2. Specialized training on advanced programming, data management, and cyber-security. Also, procurement and implementation of specialized network security equipment.
  3. Planning, monitoring, and logistics support for the deployment of RNP’s mobile units in highly insecure and poor localities for the provision of services linked to national identification and civil registry, including new born and late registrations, reissuance of certificates, and requests for id-card reissuance.
  4. Adoption of new approaches to bring RNP’s basic services closer to relevant locations such as universities and morgues (*Centros de Registro e Identificacion Ciudadana – CRIC*).
  5. Adoption of new protocols and practices for information exchange with the TSE.

Moreover, UNDP provided analysis and follow up of the electoral calendar and emerging electoral issues to the UN Country Team and as the international community resident in Honduras. UNDP was an active member (including leading) of the Electoral Working Group (*Mesa de Seguimiento Electoral)* which is the International Community´s (G-16) technical advisory mechanism on electoral matters.

1. **PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

A joint Project Management Unit (PMU) was hosted in TSE and RNP headquarters. During 2017, the PMU team was comprised of a Chief Technical Advisor/Project Coordinator, a Procurement Specialist, a Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant, and a National Technical Assistant. The PMU’s staff worked closely with TSE and RNP designated officials in the implementation of the Project. The Project structure and staff faced several changes during the life-time of the project.

The Project was overseen by Project Steering Committee for each component, composed of the beneficiary institution (TSE or RNP), UNDP, USAID, and representatives of the Ministry of External Cooperation.

1. **LATEST DEVELOPMENTS**

The 2017 general elections were held on November 26th, with an estimated national average turnout of 58% with no major technical, logistical or security issues[[2]](#footnote-3). Performance indicators showed that the main processes linked to electoral operations were well managed by the TSE, for example (a) tally sheet transmission rate reached 81% since 12,967 out of the 16,000 tally sheets originally planned were transmitted on elections night and (b) the call center could satisfactorily answer 82% of received calls.

However, the situation started to get tense during the processing of results tally sheets and the delayed announcement of partial preliminary results by the TSE approx. 9 hours after the closure of the polls whereas these were usually announced 3 hours after voting closes. This delay and failures in the TSE’s technological system heightened mistrust and led to requests for revisions, re-counts, the annulment of the presidential election and even, severe episodes of post-electoral violence.

In the meantime, in accordance with the electoral law, candidates filed 126 electoral complaints before the TSE, but all of them were rejected. Consequently, the TSE announced on December 18 the final results, which led to the installation in January 2017 of (a) 128 seats to the National Congress, (b) 20 seats to the Central American Parliament, (c) 298 municipal corporations, and (d) the reelected President of the Republic. The term for these national authorities will end in January 2022.

Also, it is relevant to take in consideration recommendations made in 2013 and 2017 by Electoral Observation Missions from the European Union and the Organization of American States. Some of these recommendations were addressed by the national authorities but several are still pending implementation.

1. **OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION**

The overall objective of the evaluation is to **(1) assess the appropriateness, timeliness and efficiency of the UNDP Electoral Technical Assistance and Citizen Identification Project in Honduras** and **(2) produce recommendations for future electoral assistance programmes**. The Evaluation is expected to improve the effectiveness of electoral assistance programmes and strengthening the electoral cycle administration and the citizen identification management in Honduras.

1. **SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

Specifically, the Evaluation aims to accomplish the following:

1. Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per the Project Document and their contributions to the outcome;
2. Identify factors, which facilitated or hindered the achievement of results, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the TSE and RNP, and document lessons learned according to the electoral cycle approach. This should include but not be limited to assessing the strengths and weaknesses in project design, management, coordination, human resource, and financial resources;
3. Assess the appropriateness of the project strategy including the institutional/management arrangements and the funding modality to reach the intended outputs and outcome;
4. Establish the extent to which the approach and implementation of the Project contributes to sustainable electoral and citizen identification management in Honduras;
5. Determine the extent to which the programme addresses crosscutting issues including gender, human rights, and conflict prevention and management;
6. Make clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of the electoral assistance by UNDP and development partners.
7. **EVALUATION SCOPE**

The evaluation will cover assistance provided for elections in 2011 and 2017.

As per the general UNDP´s evaluations principles, the evaluation must consider the ways the intervention sought to strengthen the application of the rights-based approach and mainstreamed gender.

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

In assessing the Project, the Evaluation will take into consideration:

1. ***Relevance:*** Involves the project’s conceptualization and design. It concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues. Relevance concerns the congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries. It also incorporated the concept of responsiveness – that is, the extent to which UNDP could respond to changing and emerging development priorities and needs in a responsive manner. Another aspect to consider is whether the challenges the project had to provide answers to were clear, objectives were achievable, and whether the relationship between the objectives, the outputs, the activities and the inputs was clear, logical and commensurate, given the context, resources and time capacity.
2. ***Effectiveness:*** is a measure of the extent to which the initiative’s intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which (progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved). Another aspect to consider is project implementation and operational performance (special attention to be given to donor’s inputs in terms of quality, quantity and timeless and the effect of these factors on the project workplan schedule and the overall management arrangements).
3. ***Efficiency:*** measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Efficiency is important in ensuring that resources have been used appropriately and in highlighting more effective uses of resources. Some of the aspects to consider are: (i) value for money of some of the huge expenditures from a comparative perspective taking into consideration the context, expected results and available options; (ii) the quality and timeless of the implementation and responsiveness of the project considering the objectives, outputs, activities and risks; (iii) international assistance role in the electoral process including funding, strategic communication and overall coordination.
4. ***Sustainability:*** measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future.
5. ***Impact:*** measures the extent to which the project contributed to institutional strengthening of the national counterparts and the level of accomplishment of the elections that were held between 2011 and 2017. The Evaluation should also assess the degree to which gender, capacity development, and other cross-cutting issues were effectively mainstreamed and addressed in project design and development. Assess the design and implementation of Project in relation to core aid effectiveness principles such as national ownership and leadership. Extract the lessons learned and best practices and elaborate specific recommendations to the participating partners and project stakeholders.

The evaluation will rate each criterion as follows:

1. **Ratings for Effectiveness and Efficiency:**

**[6] Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency

**[5] Satisfactory (S):** There were only minor shortcomings

**[4] Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** there were moderate shortcomings

**[3] Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**: the project had significant shortcomings

**[2] Unsatisfactory (U):** there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency

**[1] Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings

1. **Ratings for Sustainability:**

**[4]** **Likely (L):** negligible risks to sustainability

**[3]** **Moderately Likely (ML):** moderate risks

**[2]** **Moderately Unlikely (MU):** significant risks

**[1]** **Unlikely (U):** severe risks

1. **Ratings for Relevance and Impact:**

**[2] Relevant (R)**

**[1] Not relevant (NR)**

1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

Some of the questions the evaluation needs to answer include for illustration:

* Were stated outputs achieved?
* What progress towards the outcomes has been made?
* What factors have contributing to achieving or not achieving intended results?
* To what extent have UNDP assistance contributed to results?
* Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What could have been done differently taking into account the local politico-electoral context?
* How did the Project team manage risks?

Evaluation questions must be agreed upon with the Reference Group and accepted or refined in consultation with the evaluator.

1. **METHODOLOGY**

Based on UNDP guidelines for evaluations, and in consultation with the UNDP Country Office in Honduras and the Reference Group, the evaluator should develop a suitable methodology for this evaluation to meet its purposes and objectives and answer the evaluation questions. The evaluation must be inclusive and participatory, involving all stakeholders into the analysis. The evaluation will consider the social, political and economic context which affects the overall performance of the outcome achievements.

During the evaluation, the evaluator is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

* Desk review of relevant documents including the various reports, concept notes, workplans, substantive revisions, technical proposals, and evaluations produced by the Project. Also, reports produced by UN Needs Assessment Missions should be reviewed (2014 and 2017);
* Key informants interviews with the TSE, RNP and UNDP Honduras Senior Management, USAID, Representatives from MSE, TSE commissioners and staff, RNP directors and staff;
* Briefing and de-briefing sessions with UNDP Senior Management, UNDP Governance Unit Coordinator, UNDP M&E Specialist, UN/EAD-DPA Political Affairs Officer, USAID officials and UNDP Chief Technical Advisor;
* Analysis of the results and M&E framework, including outcome and output indicators and targets, as well as key deliverables to measure performance and status of implementation, strengthens and weaknesses of original M&E design, and the quality it generated.

1. **EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)**
2. **Inception report:** seven (7) days after contract signature. The document will include a detailed approach and methodology, schedule, and a draft data collection protocol. In par­ticular, the work plan will require a clear approach to data collection and work organization to examine the project in its full scope. The work plan will be evaluated by the Reference Group for quality and content, upon which clearance to proceed with the full evaluation will be granted.
3. **Draft report:**  eight (8) days after field visit concluded, the Evaluator will present a written draft report and will present findings and preliminary recommendations to the Reference Group (debriefing session). The purpose of the draft report and the debriefing session is to provide opportunity for initial validation and support further elaboration of the Evaluator’s findings and recommendations. The quality of the report will be assessed by the Reference Group.
4. **Final report:** five (5) days of receiving the consolidated comments from the Reference Group, the Evaluator will submit a final document that addresses relevant comments and provides comprehensive reporting on all elements of the assignment. This report will be submitted to the Reference Group for review. Final clearance will be provided by UNDP Deputy Resident Representative in Honduras.
5. **EVALUATOR REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**
6. Advanced university degree in political science, international development or related field;
7. 7 to 10 years of work experience in electoral technical assistance;
8. Sound knowledge and understanding of the specifics and developments in political and electoral context in Honduras is an asset;
9. Previous experience in conducting electoral assistance evaluations, preferably with UN/UNDP;
10. Excellent domain of Spanish and fluency in English (the report will be produced in Spanish);
11. The evaluator must be independent from any organization that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is being subject to evaluation;
12. The evaluator should provide references, resumes and work samples to corroborate the work experience.
13. **EVALUATION ETHICS**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG´s “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation” and will describe critical issues evaluator must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

* **Evaluator:**
  + Reports to the UNDP Honduras Deputy Resident Representative.
  + Works under the guidance of the Reference Group, presenting all the progress made to this group as well as findings and recommendations for validation and clearance.
  + Elaborates and presents the agenda of interviews to the Reference Group for validation and clearance.
  + Is responsible for carrying out the evaluation in accordance with these Terms of Reference, the technical and methodological proposal, as well as the policies and ethical standards established by UNDP.
  + Is responsible of its own logistics arrangements.
* **Reference Group:**
  + Ensures the quality of the evaluation.
  + Provides recommendations, feedback and advice throughout the evaluation process.
  + Reviews the deliverables of the evaluation.
* **Project:**
  + Ensures the Secretariat of the Reference Group.
  + Organizes, compiles and delivers, on time, the list of all documents that will be reviewed by the Evaluator.
  + Contributes to meeting arrangements in accordance with the in-county work agenda.

1. **PAYMENTS**

Payments will be made in two installments:

1: presentation of inception report (10%)

2: submission of draft report (30%)

3: submission of final report (60%)

1. **DOCUMENTS TO BE PROVIDED BY UNDP**
2. Project document, revisions, modifications, annual work plan and budget
3. Needs Assessments Missions’ reports
4. Progress reports, technical notes, and concept notes
5. Electoral law and regulations
6. Lessons Learnt report
7. Financial audit report
8. Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN system
9. MOE reports

**\*\*\*\*\***

1. **ANNEXES**
2. **ANNEX 1: final report structure (outline)**

Título y páginas introductorias.

Índice de contenidos.

Lista acrónimos y abreviaturas

Resumen ejecutivo.

Introducción

Descripción de la intervención

Alcance y objetivos de la evaluación

• Alcance de la evaluación.

• Objetivos de la evaluación.

• Criterios de la evaluación.

• Preguntas de la evaluación.

Enfoque de la evaluación y métodos.

• Fuentes de información.

• Muestra y marco de muestra

• Procedimientos e instrumentos de recopilación de datos

• Estándares de desempeño.

• Participación de las partes interesadas.

• Consideraciones éticas.

• Información sobre antecedentes de los evaluadores.

• Principales limitaciones de la metodología.

Análisis de datos.

Hallazgos y conclusiones.

• Hallazgos.

• Conclusiones.

Recomendaciones.

Lecciones aprendidas.

Anexos del informe:

• Los Términos de Referencia de la evaluación.

• Documentación adicional relacionada con la metodología, tales como la matriz de evaluación e instrumentos de recopilación de datos (cuestionarios, guías de entrevistas, protocolos de observación, etc.), según convenga.

• Listas de individuos o grupos entrevistados o consultados y de lugares visitados.

• Lista de documentos de apoyo examinados.

• Mapas de resultados de proyectos o programas o marcos de resultados.

• Tablas de resumen de los hallazgos, como tablas que presenten los avances hacia los productos, las metas y objetivos en relación con los indicadores establecidos.

• Biografías breves de los evaluadores y justificación de la composición del equipo.

• Código de conducta firmado por el evaluador.

1. **Evaluation Matrix:**

The evaluation matrix is a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

Suggestion of Evaluation Matrix to be included in the inception report:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A. sample evaluation matrix** | | | | | | | |
| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific Sub-Questions | Data Sources | Data collection Methods/tools | Indicators/ success standard | Methods for data analysis |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. TSE organizational chart: <https://www.tse.hn/WEB/institucion/organigrama.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. N-26, MOE-UE, and MOE-OEA preliminary reports are available in <https://1drv.ms/f/s!AsK2FNz8LQqKg3sOtXgpuxhstoOb> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)