

# Terms of Reference

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)” (previously called “Assessments of Development Results (ADRs)”) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national effort for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document; and
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders and the Executive Board.

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.<sup>1</sup> The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of the IEO is two-fold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (b) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function, and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership.

The UNDP programme in Paraguay has been selected for an ICPE since its country programme will end in 2019. The ICPE will be conducted in 2018 to feed into the development of the new country programme. This is the second country-level evaluation conducted by the IEO in Paraguay, after the ADR carried out in 2010 for the period 2007-11<sup>2</sup>. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration the UNDP Paraguay country office, the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (from now on referred to as the Regional Bureau), and with the main national and international counterparts of UNDP in the country. Results of the ICPE are expected to feed into the development of the new country programme 2020-2024.

## 2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Republic of Paraguay is a landlocked country located in central South America. Paraguay is bordered by Bolivia to the Northwest, Brazil to the East and Northeast, and Argentina to the South and Southwest. According to the National Statistics, Surveys and Census Division, for 2016 Paraguay had an estimated population of 6.854.636 inhabitants, and a density of 17.2 people per square kilometer<sup>3</sup>.

Paraguay is a Democratic Republic governed by the 1992 National Constitution drawn by a Constituent Assembly<sup>4</sup>. In recent years Paraguay has witnessed one of the fastest economic growth rates and

---

<sup>1</sup> See UNDP Evaluation Policy [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2016/Evaluation\\_policy\\_EN\\_2016.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2016/Evaluation_policy_EN_2016.pdf). The evaluations are conducted in adherence to the Norms and the Standards and the ethical Code of Conduct set by the United Nations Evaluation Group ([www.uneval.org](http://www.uneval.org)).

<sup>2</sup> See evaluation report at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/paraguay.shtml>

<sup>3</sup> See Multiple Indicator Survey by Conglomerate (MICS) 2016: <http://www.dgeec.gov.py/Publicaciones/Biblioteca/mics2016/Encuesta%20MICS%20Paraguay%202016.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> The Constitution of Paraguay

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

productivity rising in Latin America<sup>5</sup>. In the first quarter of 2017, the quarterly Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of Paraguay registered a year-over-year growth of 6.6%<sup>6</sup>. During that same period, agriculture expanded by 3.7% in terms of its year-over-year variation rate, while the livestock, forestry, and fishing sector showed a variation of 4.6%<sup>7</sup>.

In 2015, Paraguay's Human Development Index (HDI) value was 0.693, ranking it 110 out of 188 countries and territories, placing it in the medium human development category<sup>8</sup>. From 2010 to 2015, total poverty at the national level decreased from 31.37% to 26.58%; however, in 2016, total poverty presented a slight increase to 28.86%<sup>9</sup>. The trend of the incidence of extreme poverty in the last 5 years has a similar behavior than that of total poverty. This decline is sustained and more significant in rural areas at 3.44 percentage points while in urban areas the levels remained at a national level of 1.65 percentage points<sup>10</sup>.

Paraguay has made progress on the social front, with a series of reforms in this area. The country achieved the Millennium Development Goal 7 Target 10 to "Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water". According to the Multiple Indicator Survey by Conglomerate (MICS) conducted in 2016, 95.3 per cent of household members drink distilled water and 80.3 per cent of household members have access to improved sanitation facilities. Moreover, there is now free access to primary health care (MDG 4, 5 and 6) and basic education (MDG 2)<sup>11</sup>, and the conditional transfer programs has expanded to benefit vulnerable populations thus contributing to a reduction in extreme poverty (MDG1 target 1A) to 10.5% of the population (from 18.8% in 1998). Despite the positive progress made, the efforts were not sufficient to reach the MDG targets.

Similarly, gender equality remains an issue in the country. The labour force participation rate of female to male was estimated to be 58.0/84.5 per cent of the population in 2014. UN Women, UNDP, and other international organizations have worked with the Paraguayan Government supporting policies to empower women, strengthen women's rights, and achieve gender equality.

The Government has made efforts to improve democratic governance as part of its National Development Plan 2030 agenda; it has focused on increasing its tax collection, modifying public expenditure composition to promote investment, improving inter-agency coordination, and strengthening institutional capacities to develop and implement public policies. Despite these efforts, challenges remain: national institutions are still weak and there is a limited civil participation in policy processes.

Climate change constitutes a serious risk for the population in Paraguay. To cope with this challenge, Paraguay has institutionalized climate change by developing several policy instruments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote climate change adaptation and mitigation measures. Since 2011, Paraguay counts with a National Climate Change Policy and a National Climate Change Commission,

---

<sup>5</sup> Boosting Productivity and Inclusive Growth in Latin America, [http://www.oecd.org/latin-america/Boosting\\_Productivity\\_Inclusive\\_Growth.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/latin-america/Boosting_Productivity_Inclusive_Growth.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Informe Cuentas Nacionales Trimestrales, Banco Central de Paraguay, <https://www.bcp.gov.py/boletin-de-cuentas-nacionales-al-cierre-del-primer-trimestre-del-2017-n806>

<sup>7</sup> Ibid

<sup>8</sup> UNDP, 'Human Development Report: Briefing note for countries on the 2016 Human Development Report', [http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr\\_theme/country-notes/PRY.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/PRY.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> Secretaría Técnica de Planificación del desarrollo Económico y Social, <http://www.stp.gov.py/v1/download/transparencia/Gacetilla-extensa.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> Resolution 1,074 of the Ministry of Public Health and Social Welfare in 2009

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

formed by 24 national institutions, and since 2014 with a National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy<sup>12</sup>. In 2015, Paraguay also developed its Climate Action Plan to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and ratified the Protocol of Kyoto. In 2017, Paraguay developed its National Mitigation Plan for Climate Change to adapt and mitigate its effects.

In 2015 the Government of Paraguay committed towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets by 2030. The SDG Commission was established in 2016 as an interagency coordination mechanism to support the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the SDG targets in the country. In 2017, the country went through a process to align its National Development Plan 2030 to the SDGs.

### 3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN PARAGUAY

UNDP's cooperation with Paraguay began in 1977 with the signature of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement by the Government of Paraguay. UNDP's work in the country is guided by two documents:

- The current United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2015-2019, which was developed by the UN country team in Paraguay comprised of 16 agencies, in coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Technical Planning Secretary (now the Technical Planning and Economic and Social Development Secretary); and
- The Country Programme Document (CPD) for 2015-2019, which was developed in accordance to the priority areas identified in the UNDAF and addresses three outcomes of UNDP's corporate strategic plan 2014-2017, as presented in table 1.

<b>Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2015-2019)</b>			
<b>Country Programme / UNDAF Outcome</b>	<b>UNDP CP Outputs</b>	<b>Indicative resources (US\$ million)</b>	
		<b>Core</b>	<b>Other</b>
PRY_OUT29/ UNDAF_OUT 1.1. Devolution and accountability: Paraguay will have reduced poverty levels, established decent work and guaranteed improvement of working population's income	1.1 Options to promote inclusive and sustainable social protection, based on best practices and lessons learned at regional level	451,930	28,572,000
	1.2 Mechanisms established to generate and broadly disseminate development knowledge solutions		
	1.3 National and sub-national systems and institutions enabled to achieve structural transformation of productive capacities for inclusive and sustainable development		
	1.4 Climate change mitigation and adaptation actions increased and implemented in all sectors based on strategic tools and multi-sectoral consensus		
	1.5 Inclusive and sustainable solutions provided to achieve energy efficiency and universal access to energy sources (particularly renewable energy), with emphasis on vulnerable populations		

<sup>12</sup>

[http://www.sen.gov.py/archivos/documentos/Politica%20Nacional%20de%20Gestion%20y%20Reduccion%20de%20Riesgos%20-%20SEN\\_6bom1efc.pdf](http://www.sen.gov.py/archivos/documentos/Politica%20Nacional%20de%20Gestion%20y%20Reduccion%20de%20Riesgos%20-%20SEN_6bom1efc.pdf)

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

PRY_OUT30/ UNDAF_OUT 2.1. Paraguay will have progressed in protecting and guaranteeing the rights of all individuals, with emphasis on vulnerable and discriminated populations	2.1 Increased management capacity and accountability of the judiciary in order to improve citizen access to justice	1,387,320	76,750,000
	2.2 Strengthened public institutions management and civil service capacities		
	2.3 Strengthened technical, management and accountability capacities of the Congress and the Superior Court of Electoral Justice, creating conditions for increased democratic participation		
	2.4 Institutions supported and dialogue processes facilitated for consensus building and effective civil society participation in national development		
	2.5 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures across sectors and stakeholders		
PRY_OUT31/ UNDAF_OUT 3.1. Paraguay will have reduced its disaster risks and increased community resilience and responsiveness to emergencies and disasters	3.1 System developed to assess natural and human-induced risks at national and sub-national levels	262,750	3,850,000
	3.2 Effective institutional, legislative and policy frameworks for the improved implementation of disaster risk management measures at national and sub-national levels		
	3.3 Systems to efficiently meet and address the impacts of natural and human-induced disasters – promoted at all government and community levels		
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,102,000</b>	<b>109,172,000</b>

Source: UNDP Paraguay Country Programme Document 2015-2019

## 4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The ICPE will cover the current programme cycle, i.e. 2015 – 2019, and will assess UNDP’s contributions to the country, as defined at the outcome level in the CPD, as well as in any underlying strategies that may have been developed/adapted during the period under review and were not necessarily captured in the CPD. The ICPE will also examine the uptake and follow up of the recommendations of the previous ADR carried out by IEO in the country for the period 2007-2011. By doing so, the ICPE will draw lessons from the past and present programmes, and will provide forward-looking recommendations as input to the formulation of UNDP Paraguay’s next country programme.

The ICPE covers the entirety of UNDP’s activities in the country and includes all interventions and activities implemented by the CO during the evaluation period, funded by core UNDP resources, donor funds, and government funds.

## 5. METHODOLOGY

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards<sup>13</sup> and to IEO's methodology for ICPEs. The ICPE will address the following three key evaluation questions<sup>14</sup>. These questions will also guide the presentation of the evaluation findings in the report.

1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC)<sup>15</sup> might be developed in consultation with the country office, as appropriate, to better understand how and under what conditions UNDP's interventions are expected to lead to i) inclusive and sustainable growth and development, ii) improved democratic governance, and iii) reduced risks to climate change and natural disasters). Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme's desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes. As part of this analysis, the CPD's evolution over the review period as well as UNDP's capacity to adapt to the changing context and respond to national development needs and priorities will be examined.

The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analyzed under evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved outcomes and the extent to which these outcomes have contributed to the intended CPD objectives. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes will be identified.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that have influenced - both positively or negatively - UNDP's contribution to results and eventually, their sustainability in the country will be examined (evaluation question 3). The utilization of resources to deliver results (including managerial practices), the extent to which the CO fostered partnerships and synergies with other actors (i.e. through south-south or triangular cooperation), and the extent to which the key principles of UNDP's Strategic Plan have been applied in the CPD design and implementation are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.<sup>16</sup>

A matrix with four criteria will be used to examine the (potential) sustainability of the identified achieved results, if any. The criteria include: ownership by beneficiaries, sufficient capacities, availability of resources and enabling institutional and social environment.

In line with UNDP's gender equality strategy 2014-17, the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all of UNDP Paraguay's programmes and operations. The Gender Results

---

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

<sup>14</sup> The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology that addresses three key evaluation questions, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD/DAC criteria.

<sup>15</sup> Theory of Change is an outcome-based approach which applies critical thinking to the design, implementation and evaluation of initiatives and programmes intended to support change in their contexts. At a critical minimum, theory of change is considered to encompass discussion of the following elements: (1) context for the initiative, including social, political and environmental conditions; long-term change that the initiative seeks to support and for whose ultimate benefit; process/sequence of change anticipated to lead to the desired long-term outcome; and (2) assumptions about how these changes might happen, as a check on whether the activities and outputs are appropriate for influencing change in the desired direction in this context; diagram and narrative summary that captures the outcome of the discussion. Source: Vogel, Isabel, "Review of the use of 'Theory of Change' in International Development" (April 2012), DFID.

<sup>16</sup> This information is extracted from analysis of the goals inputted in the Enhanced RBM platform, the financial results in the Executive Snapshot, the results in the Global Staff Survey, and interviews at the management/ operations in the country office.

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

Effectiveness Scale (GRES) will be used for this purpose. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes. This information will be used to provide corporate level evidence on the performance of the associated fund and programme.

### 6. DATA COLLECTION

**Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data.** An assessment was carried out to identify available evaluable data as well as potential data collection constraints and opportunities. The Evaluation Resource Center (ERC) information indicates that 12 decentralized evaluations (8 projects, 3 outcomes, 1 UNDAF) were carried out for the 2010-2014 period and 4 project evaluations from 2015 to date. With respect to the indicators, the CPD (Paraguay Outcomes 29, 30, and 31), UNDP Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) and the corporate planning system associated with it also provide baselines, indicators, targets, as well as annual data on the status of the indicators. There is also good availability of UNDP project and strategic documents and monitoring reports. In addition, Paraguay has a good national statistical capacity since the General Directorate of Statistics, Surveys and Censuses (DGEEC) regularly publishes official statistical data of the country. Based on the preliminary desk research, the existence of 15 evaluations, the availability of documentation and the country national statistical capacity, there is sufficient evaluable data to conduct the evaluation.

**Data collection methods.** The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources such as desk review of available documents and interviews with key stakeholders. An advance survey/questionnaire with key questions may be administered to the country office to validate the collected corporately available self-reported data and fill any data gaps before the mission. Interview guidelines will also be developed to guide discussions with key stakeholders in a structured manner.

As part of the desk review, a list of projects will be developed and used to select interventions for in-depth review during the main data collection phase. The criteria for selection include:

- Programme coverage (projects covering the various components, cross-cutting areas and gender<sup>17</sup>);
- Financial expenditure (projects of all sizes, both large and smaller pilot projects);
- Geographic coverage (not only national level and urban-based ones, but also in the various regions);<sup>18</sup>
- Maturity (covering both completed and active projects);
- Programme cycle (coverage of projects/activities from the past and mainly the current cycles); and
- Degree of “success” (coverage of successful projects, as well as projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned).

The IEO and CO will identify an initial list of background and programme-related documents of relevance for the evaluation team. The following secondary data will be included for desk reviews: background

---

<sup>17</sup> The gender marker, a corporate tool at UNDP, is assigned for all projects, using scores from 3 to 0. A score of 3 means the project has gender equality as the main objective; a 2 indicates that the intended outputs that have gender equality as a significant objective. A 1 signifies outputs that will contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly, and a 0 refers to outputs that are not expected to contribute noticeably to gender equality.

<sup>18</sup> Given the territorial inequalities in the country and differences between urban and rural areas, the analysis will reach out and validate the results and development inequalities at the departmental level where UNDP (and national or UN partners) operate.

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

documents on the national context, reports prepared by international partners and other UN agencies during the period under review; programmatic documents such as workplans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs); and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners, including the quality assurance reports.

All information and data collected from multiple sources will be triangulated to ensure its validity. An evaluation matrix will be used to organize the available evidence by key evaluation question. This will also facilitate the analysis process and will support the evaluation team in drawing well substantiated conclusions and recommendations.

**Stakeholder engagement.** A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed to engage with stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the inception phase, a stakeholder analysis will identify relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to: i) identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, ii) assess UNDP's position vis-à-vis other actors, and iii) identify any potential partnerships that could further improve UNDP's contribution to the country.

Consultations will take place with government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus group discussions will be used with some beneficiary groups as appropriate.

## 7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

**Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP:** The IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Paraguay country office, the Regional Bureau and the Government of Paraguay. The IEO lead evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will bear all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

**UNDP Country Office in Paraguay:** The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders and ensure that all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country is available to the team. In addition, the country office will provide the evaluation team with in kind organizational support (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries; assistance for project site visits). To ensure the independence of the views expressed, country office staff will not participate in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes. At the report writing and debriefing phase, the country office will provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis and will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a video-conference with the IEO, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the country office will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process. The CO senior management will eventually be responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the Management Response to the evaluation, in consultation with the Regional Bureau.

**UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean:** The Regional Bureau will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations. Moreover, it will support the preparation of the management response by the CO.

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

**Evaluation Team:** The IEO will establish an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. The evaluation team will comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the country programme, and to the extent possible, will have had no previous involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the country programme. The team will be composed of:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for developing the evaluation design and terms of reference; managing the conduct of the ICPE, preparing/ finalizing the final report; and organizing the final stakeholder presentation, as appropriate, with the country office.
- **Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE):** IEO staff member with the general responsibility to support the LE, including in the preparation of terms of reference, data collection and analysis and the final report.
- **Consultants:** 2 External, independent consultants (preferably national, or regional/international, as needed) will be recruited to assess two of the outcome areas under the guidance of the LE, they will conduct preliminary research, data collection in the field, prepare outcome analysis papers, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE report. All consultants should have experience on gender mainstreaming and human rights-based approaches to evaluations.
- **Research Assistant:** A research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and preliminary analysis support.

The tentative roles of the different members of the evaluation team are summarized in Table 2. The arrangements and roles among the evaluation team will be agreed following the selection of the evaluation consultants.

<b>Team member</b>	<b>Outcome/Area</b>
Lead evaluator and Inclusive sustainable development specialist	Outcome 29 + assessment of cross-cutting issues
Democratic Governance Specialist	Outcome 30 + assessment of cross-cutting issues
Associate lead evaluator	Outcome 31 + assessment of cross-cutting issues

## 8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process, divided in five main phases, as follows:

**Phase 1: Preparatory work.** The IEO prepares the ToR and the evaluation design, including an overall evaluation matrix. Once the TOR is approved, additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals will be recruited. The IEO starts collecting data and documentation internally first and then filling data gaps with help from the UNDP country office. Additional evaluation team members, comprising development professionals, will be recruited once the ToR is complete.

**Phase 2: Desk analysis.** Evaluation team members will conduct desk review of reference material, and identify specific evaluation questions, and issues. Further in-depth data collection will be conducted, by administering a pre-mission questionnaire and interviews (via phone, Skype, etc.) with key stakeholders, including country office staff. Based on this, detailed questions, gaps and issues that require validation during the field-based phase of the data collection will be identified.



## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

**Phase 3: Field data collection:** This phase will take place in March 2018. During this period, the evaluation team undertakes a mission to the country to engage in data collection. The estimated duration of the mission is a total of 3 calendar weeks. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 5 with responsibilities outlined in Section 7. The evaluation team will liaise with CO staff and management, key government stakeholders and other partners and beneficiaries. At the end of the mission, the evaluation team holds a formal debriefing to present the key preliminary findings at the country office.

**Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief.** Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated evidence, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The first draft (“zero draft”) of the ICPE report will be subject to a peer review by the IEO and the International Evaluation Advisory Panel. Once the first draft is quality cleared it will be circulated with the country office and the Regional Bureau for review including factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. An “audit trail” will be prepared to document and respond to comments received from the CO, Regional Bureau, and national stakeholders. Any necessary additional corrections will be made and the country office will prepare the management response to the ICPE, under the overall oversight of the Regional Bureau. The report will then be shared at a final debriefing where the IEO presents the results of the evaluation to key national stakeholders. Ways forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the recommendations and strengthening national accountability of UNDP. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the final evaluation report will be published.

**Phase 5: Publication and dissemination.** The ICPE final report and brief summary will be widely distributed in hard and electronic versions. The initial and final versions of the ICPE report will be produced in English, following the standard IEO publication guidelines. A Spanish version of the report will be produced, as needed and requested by the country office. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board at the time of its CPD approval. It will be distributed by the IEO within UNDP and to the evaluation units of other international organizations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The country office and the Government of Paraguay will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website<sup>19</sup> as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.<sup>20</sup>

## 9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The tentative<sup>21</sup> timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are as follows:

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
<b>Phase 1: Preparation</b>		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	January 2018
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	January 2018
<b>Phase 2: Desk analysis</b>		

<sup>19</sup> [web.undp.org/evaluation](http://web.undp.org/evaluation)

<sup>20</sup> [erc.undp.org](http://erc.undp.org)

<sup>21</sup> The timeframe is indicative of the process and deadlines, and does not imply full-time engagement of the evaluation team during the period.

## UNDP INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	February 2018
<b>Phase 3: Data collection</b>		
Data collection mission and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	4-24 March 2018
<b>Phase 4: Analysis, Synthesis and report writing</b>		
Analysis and Synthesis	Evaluation team	April 2018
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO	LE + ALE	May 2018
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/Regional Bureau	June 2018
Second draft shared with GOV	CO/GOV	July 2018
Draft management response	CO/Regional Bureau	July – August 2018
Final debriefing with national stakeholders	CO/LE	tbc
<b>Phase 4: Production and Follow-up</b>		
Editing and formatting	IEO	September 2018
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	October 2018
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	October 2018
Presentation to the Executive Board	IEO	June 2019