

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)”, previously known as “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
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.¹ 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. Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

Following the first country programme evaluation conducted in 2009², this is the second country-level evaluation conducted by the IEO in Guatemala. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Guatemala, with the UNDP Guatemala Country office, and with the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean. The results of, and lessons learned from, the ICPE are expected to feed into the development of the new country programme 2020-2024.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Republic of Guatemala, located in Central America, has an area³ of 108,889 km² and a total population of 16.5 million⁴, with 51 percent of the population living in rural areas⁵ and 70 percent under 30 years of age⁶. With 40 percent of its population considered indigenous⁷, Guatemala is a multicultural and multiethnic country, with 24 linguistic groups and 3 major indigenous groups.

¹ See UNDP Evaluation Policy: www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf. The ICPE will also be conducted in adherence to the Norms and the Standards and the ethical Code of Conduct established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (www.uneval.org).

² <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/guatemala.shtml>

³2011 Caracterización República de Guatemala:

<https://www.ine.gob.gt/sistema/uploads/2014/02/26/L5pNHMXzy5FFWmk9NHCrK9x7E5Qqvvy.pdf>

⁴ Guatemala en Cifras 2017: http://www.banguat.gob.gt/Publica/guatemala_en_cifras_2017.pdf

⁵ Guatemala en Cifras 2017: http://www.banguat.gob.gt/Publica/guatemala_en_cifras_2017.pdf

⁶ UNDP Guatemala Country Programme Document 2015-2019

⁷Caracterización estadística República de Guatemala 2012 (available information to date):

<https://www.ine.gob.gt/sistema/uploads/2014/02/26/5eTCcFIHernaNVeUmm3iabXHaKgXtw0C.pdf>

Between the 1960s and mid-1990s, Guatemala experienced a long-term conflict between the guerrilla forces and military governments, affecting mostly indigenous people. The conflict ended in 1996 with the signature of the Peace Agreement. Since then, Guatemala has improved its legal and institutional frameworks, but continues to face challenges in strengthening regulations and law enforcement. Institutional weaknesses, low budget, a poor regulatory framework, lack of confidence in the judicial system, coupled with violence and low citizen participation, remain important concerns in the country.

Guatemala has not achieved significant results in terms of economic growth and poverty reduction. Due to limited investments in the public and private sectors and sluggish physical and human capital growth, Guatemala's economic growth has been slow and unstable. The main economic sources in the country are agriculture, commerce and services, and manufacturing industry, with agriculture employing 32 per cent of the labor force.⁸ While the unemployment rate remains low (3.1 percent in 2016)⁹, 69.8 percent of the active population works in the informal sector¹⁰. In 2016, the "World Bank doing business index" ranked it 97 out of 100.¹¹ The government collects the lowest share of public revenues in the world relative to the size of its economy.¹²

In terms of poverty reduction, inequalities remain high with a GINI coefficient of 0.531, one of the highest in the world¹³. In 2016, the national poverty level was 59.28 percent and the extreme poverty rate was 23.36 percent.¹⁴ More than 80 percent of indigenous people are under the poverty line, with 47% living in conditions of extreme multidimensional poverty.¹⁵

Guatemala has one of the highest population growth rates in Latin America (2.4 per cent)¹⁶ and its economic growth is insufficient to cover the needs of the population (e.g. food, education, health, basic services, etc.). In 2015, Guatemala's Human Development Index (HDI) value was 0.640¹⁷; positioning the country at 125 out of 188 countries (medium human development category). Guatemala made progress in the achievement of the MDGs but this was still insufficient (62.5 percent of the goals were very far from being fulfilled).¹⁸ Almost half the population cannot afford the basic food basket, leading to the highest prevalence of stunting in children under 5 (46.5 percent) in Latin America and one of the highest in the world.¹⁹ The lack of access to health and education are also important challenges. Guatemala has one of

⁸ Caracterización estadística República de Guatemala 2012:

<https://www.ine.gob.gt/sistema/uploads/2014/02/26/5eTCcFIHERnaNVEUmm3iabXHaKgXtw0C.pdf>

⁹ Guatemala en Cifras 2017: http://www.banguat.gob.gt/Publica/guatemala_en_cifras_2017.pdf

¹⁰ Primer Informe de Gobierno 2016-2017:

<http://www.segeplan.gob.gt/nportal/index.php/biblioteca-documental/category/108-informe-2016?download=584:primer-informe-de-gobierno-2016-2017>

¹¹ The World Bank, Doing Business: <http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploreeconomies/guatemala>

¹² World Bank: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/guatemala/overview#1>

¹³ Guatemala Human Development Report 2016: <http://desarrollohumano.org.gt/estadisticas/estadisticas-indicadores-basicos/indicadores-basicos/>

¹⁴ Guatemala en Cifras 2017: http://www.banguat.gob.gt/Publica/guatemala_en_cifras_2017.pdf

¹⁵ Guatemala UNDAF 2015-2019

¹⁶ Guatemala, Política Económica 2016-2021, Crecimiento Económico Incluyente y Sostenible:

http://www.centralamericadata.com/docs/PoliticaEconomica2016_2021_GT.pdf

¹⁷ Human Development Report 2016 – Briefing notes Guatemala:

http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/GTM.pdf

¹⁸ Informe final de cumplimientos de los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio, Guatemala 2015:

<http://desarrollohumano.org.gt/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/ODM-2015-Cuarto-Informe.pdf>

¹⁹ <http://www1.wfp.org/countries/guatemala>

the lowest levels of education in Latin America and among countries with similar income. In 2013, the government spent only 2.8 per cent of the GDP in education.²⁰

Gender equality, and in particular women's participation in economic and political activities, remains an important challenge with only 13.9 percent of the seats in the national parliament held by women in 2016.²¹ Between 2012 and 2015, 339 of the 3,877 elected officials were women and 21 of the 158 members of Congress were indigenous people.²² Despite a solid legal framework²³, violence against women and its impunity are still very prevalent.

The country is also susceptible to climate change as a large part of its territory is affected by natural disasters and adverse weather conditions (El Niño that causes prolonged droughts, La Niña which generates abundant rain). It ranks in the top five countries in the world most affected by floods, hurricanes and earthquakes, with 40.8 percent of the population exposed to five or more threats simultaneously. The rural population is very vulnerable to extreme weather events, which increases their food insecurity and malnutrition. However, the country lacks the required resources and policies to combat these climatic variations.

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN GUATEMALA

Relations between the Government of Guatemala and the United Nations system were formalized on 1998. The work of UNDP in the country is guided by the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2015-2019. The UNDAF was developed by the UN country team composed of 17 Resident agencies and 5 non-resident agencies, in coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MINEX), the Office of Planning and Programming (SEGEPLAN), and the National Statistics Institute (INE).

In line with the K'atun National Development Plan: our Guatemala 2032, the UNDAF 2015-2019 and the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017, UNDP intended to "contribute to the development of a resilient, equitable and inclusive country, engaged on social peace and focused on indigenous populations, women and youth living in poverty and extreme poverty in territories with lower human development index and less presence of the State". UNDP committed to support, in an integrated manner, the following programme priorities: (a) inclusive and sustainable development; (b) rule of law and peace; and (c) active and inclusive citizenship. The programme is expected to use a human rights-based approach and promote the participation of women throughout its implementation.

²⁰ UN data: <http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=Guatemala>

²¹ UN data: <http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=Guatemala>

²² UNDP CPD 2015-2019

²³ The government enacted different laws on the integrated development of women, family violence, sexual violence, trafficking, exploitation and femicide, and designed policies such as the National Policy for the Promotion and Integral Development of Women. Other mechanisms exist such as the "Defensoría de la Mujer Indígena" and the "Secretaría Presidencial de la Mujer".

Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2015-2019) ²⁴			
Country Programme Outcome		Indicative resources (US\$)	Indicative expenditures to date (US\$)
OUT 8 (25 projects)	The Urban and Rural Development Councils system and the corresponding governmental institutions jointly develop policies and investments that foster protection, responsible use and conservation of natural resources and community resilience	\$45,000,000	\$60,292,670
OUT 9 (19 projects)	Access to justice. Justice institutions increase the efficiency and effectiveness in case solving, within inclusion and equity levels.	\$45,000,000	\$58,967,798
OUT 10 (9 projects)	Indigenous people, mainly young and female, exercise active citizenship and effectively participate in development-related decision-making at the community, municipal, departmental and national levels.	\$10,000,000	\$5,124,228
Total		\$100,000,000	\$124,384,696

Source: UNDP Guatemala Country Programme Document 2015-2019 / UNDP systems

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme in order to feed into the process of developing the new country programme. The ICPE will focus on the current programme cycle (2015-2019), but given that the first country programme evaluation was conducted in 2009, the evaluation will also follow up on ADR recommendations. It will also consider the cumulative results of projects running from the past programme cycle into the current one to provide forward-looking recommendations as input to UNDP Guatemala’s formulation of its next country programme.

ICPEs focus on formal UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board; country programmes are defined – depending on the programme cycle and the country – in the Country Programme Document (CPD) and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). The scope of the ICPE includes the entirety of UNDP’s activities in the country, therefore covers interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds. There will also be initiatives from the regional and global programmes included in the scope of the ICPE. It is important to note, however, that the UNDP county office may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these ‘non-project’ activities may be crucial for the political and social agenda of a country.

5. METHODOLOGY

²⁴Source: UNDP Guatemala Country Programme Document 2015-2019 for Indicative Resources. The data for the indicative expenditures to date for the three outcomes is from the Combined Delivery Report produced by the NY Office of Financial Resources Management (shared by the CO). Differences have been found with Atlas/ Power BI (data provided as of 30 January 2018 for the Regional/Global projects and \$90,281,852 for outcome 8; \$56,924,254 for outcome 9; \$ 4,511,022 for outcome 10). The data will be further validated with the CO.

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.²⁵ The ICPE will address the following three key evaluation questions.²⁶ 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?

The ICPE is conducted at the outcome level. To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate. 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. Where data gaps are apparent, a qualitative approach will be taken to fill those gaps to aid in the evaluation process. As part of this analysis, the CPD's progression over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD's evolution, UNDP's capacity to adapt to the changing context and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at. The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analysed 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 also be identified.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that have influenced - both positively or negatively - UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results in the country will be examined under 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 Plan²⁷ have been applied in the CPD design and implementation are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.²⁸ Qualitative rating scales will be used to assess (i) the degree to which a factor was a significant constraint on effectiveness of program implementation and achievement of outcomes; and (ii) the degree to which the UNDP was successful in addressing/managing the constraint.

Special attention will be given to integrate a gender equality, conflict sensitivity and indigenous people approach to data collection methods. To assess gender across the portfolio, the evaluation will use the gender marker²⁹ and the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES). The GRES, developed as part of the corporate evaluation on UNDP's contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment, classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative.

²⁵ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

²⁶ The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria.

²⁷ These principles include: national ownership and capacity; human rights-based approach; sustainable human development; gender equality and women's empowerment; voice and participation; South-South and triangular cooperation; active role as global citizens; and universality.

²⁸ 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.

²⁹ A corporate tool to sensitize programme managers in advancing GEWE by assigning ratings to projects during their design phase to indicate the level of expected contribution to GEWE. It can also be used to track planned programme expenditures on GEWE (not actual expenditures).

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. A preliminary 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 15 evaluations (13 projects, 1 outcome, 1 UNDAF) were carried out for the 2010-2014 period, and 7 evaluations (4 projects, 3 outcomes) for the 2015-2019 cycle to date. With respect to indicators, the CPD (Guatemala Outcomes 8, 9, 10), UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) and the corporate planning system associated with it also provide baseline, indicators, targets, and annual data on the status of indicators. In this context, there is a good availability of UNDP projects, strategic documents, and monitoring reports. In addition, Guatemala has good national statistical capacity since the National Statistics Institute (INE) regularly publishes official statistical data of the country. Regarding programme results (outcomes) and outputs, data sources are reliable and the baselines are clear. However, the annual data on the status of the indicators is not fully updated given that some poverty indicators at national level have not been recently collected. The security level is moderate, and constraints to primary data collection are not envisaged.

Data collection methods. The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of documentation, surveys and information and interviews with key stakeholders, including beneficiaries, partners and project managers. Specific evaluation questions and the data collection method will be further detailed and outlined in the outcome analysis. A pre-mission questionnaire will be administered to the M&E focal point and, as needed, other key counterparts in the country office at the onset of data collection (March). Special attention will be given to integrate a gender equality responsive approach to the evaluation methods and reporting. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviews include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral and multilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. At the start of the evaluation, a stakeholder analysis will be conducted with the support of the CO to identify relevant UNDP partners, as well as those who may not work with UNDP, but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, and to examine any potential partnerships that could further improve UNDP's contribution to the country.

The criteria for selecting projects for field visits include:

- Programme coverage (projects covering the various components and cross-cutting areas);
- 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);
- Maturity (covering both completed and active projects);
- Programme cycle (coverage of projects/activities from the past and mainly the current cycles);
- Degree of "success" (successful projects and projects with difficulties where lessons can be learned).

The IEO and the country office will identify an initial list of background and programme-related documents which will be posted on an ICPE SharePoint website. Document reviews will include: background documents on the national context, documents 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. The evaluation matrix will be used to guide how each of the questions will be addressed 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.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Guatemala Country office, the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Government of Guatemala. The IEO Lead Evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will cover all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

UNDP Country office in Guatemala: the country office (CO) will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders, make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The CO will provide support in kind (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; assistance for field site visits). To ensure the anonymity of interviewees, the country office staff will not participate in the stakeholder interviews. The CO and IEO will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a videoconference, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the CO will prepare a management response in consultation with RB and will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

Evaluation Team: The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. The IEO will aim to ensure gender balance in the team, which will include the following members:

- **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 stakeholder debrief, as appropriate, with the country office.
- **Associate Evaluator (AE):** 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. Together with the LE, will help backstop the work of other team members.
- **Consultants:** two external national consultants and one regional consultant will be recruited to collect data and help to assess the outcome areas, paying attention to gender equality and women's empowerment and indigenous people's rights. Under the guidance of LE, they will conduct preliminary desk review, data collection in the field, prepare sections of the report, and contribute to preparing and reviewing the final ICPE report.
- **Research Assistant:** A research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and will support the portfolio analysis.

The roles of the different members of the evaluation team can be summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome (tentative)		
Outcome	Report	Data collection
Inclusive sustainable development (Outcome 1)	LE/AE/RA + one national consultant	
Rule of law, peace and equal access to justice (Outcome 2)	LE/AE/RA + one regional consultant	
Active and inclusive citizenship (Outcome 3)	LE/AE/RA + one national consultant	

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute the framework for conducting the evaluation.

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.

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.

Phase 3: Field data collection. During this phase, the evaluation team undertakes a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission will be 2.5 weeks, from 21 May to 5 June 2018. 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 debrief presentation of 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, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The zero draft of the report will be subject to peer review by IEO and the Evaluation Advisory Panel (IEAP). It will then be circulated to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any necessary additional corrections will be made and the UNDP Guatemala 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 (via videoconference) where the results of the evaluation are presented 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 report and brief summary will be widely distributed in hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board at the time of the approval of a new Country Programme Document. It will be distributed by the IEO within UNDP and to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Guatemala Country office and Government of Guatemala will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website and the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The Regional Bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the ERC.

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively³⁰ as follows:

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in 2019		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	January
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	February
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	March - April
Phase 3: Data collection		
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	21 May – 5 June
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	LE	June
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO	LE	July
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RB	August
Second draft shared with GOV	CO/GOV	August
Draft management response	CO/RB	September
Final debriefing with national stakeholders	CO/LE	September - October
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	September-October
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	September-October
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	September-October
Presentation to the Executive Board	IEO	September 2019 or January 2020

³⁰ The timeframe is indicative of process and deadlines and does not imply full-time engagement of the team during the period.