

Terms of Reference

Final Evaluation of Project: Belize's *Public Awareness and Preparedness Campaign on the Question of Referring Guatemala's Claim to the ICJ*

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The governments of Belize and Guatemala signed a special agreement on 8 December 2008, known as the *Compromis*, to submit Guatemala's territorial, insular and maritime claim to the ICJ (International Court of Justice) for a binding ruling, although only after consulting their respective populations through national referenda. Article 7 of the *Compromis* specifies the following question would be put to voters in simultaneous referenda to be held at an agreed date:

'Do you agree that any legal claim of Guatemala against Belize relating to land and insular territories and to any maritime areas pertaining to these territories should be submitted to the International Court of Justice for final settlement and that it determines finally the boundaries of the respective territories and areas of the Parties'.

In 2014, under the auspices of the Organization of American States (OAS), progress was made between the governments of Belize and Guatemala. The two countries reached an agreement on a roadmap for strengthening their bilateral relations and formulated a plan of action. This followed the establishment of a Joint Binational Commission responsible for development and oversight of projects and programmes for cooperation between the two countries and an amendment to the 2008 agreement.

Both countries agreed that submission to the ICJ (International Court of Justice) must be preceded by consultation with their respective populations through national referenda. The Government of Belize then indicated it would hold the referendum in April 2019. A public outreach campaign on the need to resolve the territorial dispute with Guatemala through the ICJ was launched on March 30th, 2018.

In July 2018, the project ***"Belize's Public Awareness and Preparedness Campaign on The Question of Referring Guatemala's Claim To The ICJ"*** (00109852) was signed between UNDP and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to support the national Public Awareness Campaign (PAC). The main donors of the project are the Government of United States of America under the Central America Regional Security Initiative (CARSI) and Government of United Kingdom under the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF).

The Project outcomes:

1. To provide the people of Belize with greater access to objective information and discussion on the Referendum

2. To improve the state's capacity to undertake an effective nationwide Referendum on the issue of whether to submit the border dispute with Guatemala to the International Court of Justice (ICJ)

The project identified two key outputs:

Output 1: *Support to the design and implementation of the national strategic communication plan to promote peaceful means of addressing the long-standing border dispute between Belize and Guatemala.*

Expected Results-Output 1:

- Youth Campaign using social media to appeal to the younger voting population and encourage their participation in the process, which is supported by media, tertiary institutions etc.
- The implementation of various communications platforms such as debates and panel discussion to allow sharing of evidence-based viewpoints, narratives featuring various opinions and positions regarding the Referendum, thus enabling the voting public to make informed choices.
- Training for media and CSOs to ensure transparency and accountability of processes, supporting the communication of information and providing for impartial coverage of the referendum process.
- Exchange with other countries to learn from their recent referendum experience.

Output 2: *Support for improved voter registry and re-registration system in Belize.*

The promotion of civil and political rights of those qualified to vote in Belizean elections through technical support in the implementation of an education and outreach campaign focused on increasing voter re-registration rates, particularly among underserved and dispersed rural populations (including women and youth). This constitutes an integral component of broader national efforts to update the voter registry.

Expected Results: Cost-effective and inclusive voter re-registration education campaign.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluation will be conducted as agreed in the project document and in accordance with the UNDP Belize Evaluation Plan (2017-2021), UNDP's Strategic Plan (2018-2021) and UNDP's Evaluation Policy which sets out several guiding principles, norms and criteria for evaluation in the organization.

Amongst the norms that the Policy seeks to uphold, the most important are that the evaluation exercise should be independent, impartial and of appropriate quality, but also that it should be intentional and designed with utility in mind. The evaluation should generate relevant and useful information to support evidence-based decision making.

This evaluation has been designed with dual purposes: 1) to allow national counterparts (Election and Boundaries Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Central America Regional Security Initiative (CARSI) and the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) and UNDP meet their accountability objectives, and 2) to capture good practices and lessons learned to improve the design and effectiveness of future programmes and projects.

The evaluation will assess the results achieved (direct and indirect, whether intended or not) from its implementation as well as whether the project achieved its intended goals. It is expected that the evaluation will follow a forward-looking approach and provide useful and actionable recommendations (end of project evaluation). In line with standard evaluation practice, the scope of the exercise is an assessment of whether on the basis of evidence available, the approach -- as implemented and in comparison with similar approaches implemented by others-- is likely to achieve the higher-level results agreed in the start of the project.

The findings, lessons learned, and recommendations generated by the evaluation will be used by UNDP and its national counterparts (Election and Boundaries Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and donors (US Department of State, Government of the United Kingdom) to improve future projects and programmes.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

To define the information that the evaluation intends to generate, the potential evaluation questions have been developed (the questions are provided below under a relevant evaluation criterion).

Relevance: The evaluator will assess the degree to which the project considers the local context and issues. Under this evaluation criterion the evaluator should, inter alia assess:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and youth and the human rights-based approach?

Effectiveness: *The evaluator will assess the extent to which results have been achieved. In evaluating effectiveness, it is useful to consider: 1) if the planning activities are coherent with the overall objectives and project purpose; 2) the analysis of principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives. Under this evaluation criterion the evaluator should assess:*

- To what extent were the outputs achieved taking into account the highly sensitive nature of the project?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective for the project?
- What foreseen and unforeseen factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project?

- In which areas did the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what were the supporting factors?
- In which areas did the project have the least achievements? What were the constraining factors and why?
- Were the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent were stakeholders involved in project implementation?
- To what extent was the project appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality and the empowerment of youth?

Efficiency: *measures how resources or inputs are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Under this evaluation criterion the evaluator should, inter alia assess:*

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent was UNDP's project implementation strategy and execution efficient and cost effective?
- To what extent were resources used efficiently? Were activities supporting the strategy cost-effective within the context of the project?
- To what extent were project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent did the monitoring processes utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability: *The evaluator will (a) identify to what extent are government partners prepared to manage future consultations and/or referendums and elections, (ii) to what extent intervention benefits will continue even after the project is concluded.*

- To what extent were lessons learned documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent the lessons learnt will provide a long-term benefit to the implementing partners?

Gender equality: *The evaluator will assess the project's capacity to contribute towards and advance equality. Under this evaluation criterion the evaluator should, inter alia assess:*

- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- How was the gender perspective mainstreamed throughout the project activities?

Impact, as an evaluation criterion, will not be utilized in this evaluation. Impact results – describing changes in people's lives and development conditions– are considered beyond the scope of this evaluation. Results at the impact level would need to control for the vast array of factors that may have influenced development

in this area and would not be feasible nor cost efficient to discern the project's and UNDP's contribution to such change

4. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials, donors, civil society organizations, subject experts, private sector representatives and community members.

The evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change” (TOC) approach to determine causal links between the interventions that UNDP has supported and observed progress in the achievement of expected results at national and local levels. The evaluator(s) will develop a logic model of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to the expected changes.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

It is expected that the evaluation will take into consideration both the qualitative and quantitative approaches, and will therefore encompass several methods including:

- ***Desk review of relevant documents such as the studies relating to the country context and situation, project documents, progress reports, and other evaluation reports.***
- ***Discussions with senior management and programme staff.***
- ***Interviews and discussions with partners and stakeholders.***
- ***Field visits to selected areas.***
- ***Questionnaires and participatory techniques for gathering information.***
- ***Consultation and debriefing meetings.***

5. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)

Evaluation inception report (Estimated 10 pages) The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP and following the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to country visit in the case of international evaluators. The inception report should include:

- a. Details the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why.
- b. Includes detailed evaluation questions, who these will be targeted at (UNDP, government stakeholders, other stakeholders, beneficiaries etc.) and how these will be answered (the evaluation matrix can be used for this)
- c. Detail proposed methodology; sources of data; and data collection procedures.

- d. List of stakeholders and beneficiaries to be interviewed.
- e. Proposed list of field validation visits.
- f. Schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables with agreed completion dates.
- g. Designated assignment of tasks and responsibilities across the evaluation team (where relevant).
- h. Agreed process for draft evaluation report review and finalization including UNDP commitment to delivery of comments, format of comments and audit trail on the evaluator's response to draft evaluation comments.
- i. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify a shared understanding of the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

Evaluation debriefing: immediately following an evaluation mission, with a presentation of key findings and recommendations to UNDP and donors (**PowerPoint presentation required**)

Draft evaluation report (estimated 25-30 pages plus annexes) with an executive summary of max. 5 pages describing key findings and recommendations).

The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period, that addresses content required (as agreed in the terms of reference and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines).

Evaluation report audit trail: Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.

Final evaluation report.

Presentations to stakeholders.

Schedule of Payments

- Payment 1: 20% to be disbursed upon completion of the Inception Report.
- Payment 2: 80% to be disbursed upon completion of the rest of deliverables.

6. QUALIFICATIONS AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The final evaluation of **Belize's Public Awareness and Preparedness Campaign** Project will be conducted by an international consultant.

- The evaluator must be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the project that is the subject of the evaluation.
- Master's degree in: Social Science, Political Science, International Affairs, Economics, Development Cooperation, Public Policy or other related discipline.
- At least seven (7) years of combined professional experience in electoral processes and evaluation.

- Demonstrated experience on UN evaluations approach (UNDP evaluation policies, UNEG norms and standards).
- Experience working or evaluating UN electoral assistance projects, an advantage.
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods to projects and/or programmes.
- Knowledge of UNDP in the Latin America and the Caribbean context, an advantage.
- Excellent report writing and editing skills.
- Excellent working knowledge (written and oral) of English.

7. EVALUATION ETHICS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluation will remain fully independent in accordance with UNDP's Evaluation Policy.

The evaluator will work in close coordination with the UNDP Belize Governance portfolio, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Elections and Boundaries Department in Belize and report to the UNDP Resident Representative a.i.

UNDP will provide support in the scheduling of meetings; agenda management and stakeholders contact information. UNDP will provide logistic support in terms of transportation to and from the meetings and interviews. UNDP will provide a working station, stationery and office materials as required; as well as soft/hard copies of required documents, as requested.

This TOR shall be the basis upon which compliance with assignment requirements and overall quality of services provided by the consultant will be assessed by UNDP.

11. APPLICATION SUBMISSION PROCESS, EVALUATION METHOD AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications in one single PDF document:

- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;

- Personal CV or P11, indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

Technical proposal:

- Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment;
- A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.

Financial proposal: that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided by UNDP. (see attached)

International consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

- i. The selection shall be made on a combined scoring method, based on a 70%-30% distribution on the technical and financial offers, respectively;
- ii. Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (=70 % of the technical score weight) on technical evaluation only, would be considered for the financial evaluation and further selection process.
- iii. Evaluation shall be based on the following criteria:

Area	Score /%
1. Technical:	
(ii) Experience: Seven (7) years of related experience with evaluation projects	25 Points
(iii) Demonstrated experience with drafting reports and documents	20 points
(iv) Relevant experience working with electoral support processes	25 points
2. Financial	30 points

iv. Monitoring and Reporting Arrangements:

The consultant shall be supervised by UNDP Head of Office and s/he will report progress on a periodical basis.

This TOR is approved by:

Signature: _____

Name and Designation: _____

Date of Signing: _____

9.TIME-FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Expected Starting day: 27 May 2019

Expected Finalization: 5 July 2019

Activity	Estimated # of work days	Date of completion	Place	Responsible party	Review & Approvals required (indicate designation of person to review and confirm acceptance)
PHASE ONE: Desk Review and Inception Report					
Meeting briefing with UNDP (Programme, Managers and project staff as needed)	1 day	At the time of contract signing	UNDP or remote meeting	Evaluation manager and commissioner	
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluator	-	At the time of contract signing	Via email	Evaluation manager and commissioner	
Desk review, evaluation design, methodology and updated work plan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Within 1 weeks of contract signing	Home Based	Evaluator	Reviewed by CO ME Focal Point, Programme Unit and approved by RR a.i.
Submission of the inception report (max 10 pages)	-	Within 2 weeks of contract signing:		Evaluator	
Comments and approval of Inception report	-	Within 3 days of submission of the Inception report	UNDP	Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Commissioner	Reviewed by CO ME Focal Point, Programme Unit and approved by RR a.i.
Phase Two: Data collection mission					
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	5 days	Within 3 weeks of signing of contract	In Country	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project	

			With field visits	staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.	
Debriefing to UNDP and Key stakeholders	1 day		In Country	Evaluation Team	
Phase Three: Evaluation Report Writing					
Preparation of draft evaluation report (30 pages maximum excluding annexes) Executive Summary (5 pages)	5 days	Within 1 week of the completion of the Field Mission	Home Based	Evaluator	
Draft Report Submission	-			Evaluator	
Consolidated UNDP and Stakeholder comments to the Draft Report	-	Within 1 week of submission of the draft evaluation report	UNDP	Evaluation manager and evaluation commissioner	
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day	Within 1 week of receipt of comments	Remotely UNDP	UNDP, stakeholders and Evaluator	
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP CO	2 days	Within 1 weeks of final debriefing	Home Based	Evaluator	
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP Country Office (max. 30 pages excluding Executive Summary and Annexes)	-	Within 5 days of final debriefing	Home Based	Evaluator	Reviewed by CO Programme Unit and approved by RR a.i.
Estimated Total days for the evaluation	20 days				