

STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW)
USAID/CAM
Final Performance Evaluation of the
Regional Citizen Security Activity (InfoSegura)

A. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the Final Performance Evaluation of the USAID Regional Citizen Security Activity (known as InfoSegura) in the northern Central American Triangle region (El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala) is to document activity achievements and challenges to date, inform USAID of any adjustments for the remainder of program implementation, and help with appropriate planning for future citizen security work. In addition, the evaluation will provide empirical evidence on management issues and support learning and continuous improvement in USAID's regional citizen security work for current and future activities.

The principal audience of this final performance evaluation within USAID/CAM, which is the Mission managing the regional activities, will be Mission Management, the Democracy and Governance Office, and the Regional Program Office. Other USAID offices with interest in the evaluation results are the Democracy and Governance Offices within USAID/Guatemala and USAID/Honduras; the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) (particularly the team who coordinates the Central America Regional Security Initiative); and the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA). The implementing partner, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), will carry out the remaining activity implementation based on findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

USAID/CAM will use the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this evaluation to make any necessary adjustments for the remainder of InfoSegura implementation, as well as determine areas and approaches for future regional citizen security activities based on USAID/CAM strategic goal and development objectives. In addition, evaluation results will be used for reporting purposes to stakeholders: Central and local governments in the Northern Triangle, other U.S. Government agencies, other bilateral and multilateral donors working on citizen security issues, civil society organizations, and academia.

The main participants in the evaluation will be the prime implementing partner (UNDP), activity beneficiaries, public institutions, academia, civil society organizations, and USAID.

This Final Performance Evaluation is scheduled for the end of calendar year 2018, with approximately one and a half years left of implementation. The evaluation will cover the period from May 30, 2014 through September 30, 2018

B. Background Information about the InfoSegura activity

As part of the Citizen Security and Good Governance component of the USAID Central America Regional Development Cooperation Strategy (RDCS), USAID/CAM signed a Public International Organization (PIO) agreement with UNDP on May 30, 2014. The activity is slated to end in May 2020. USAID/CAM has modified the agreement five times to adjust activities and results, and to increase the total funding amount from approximately \$12,000,000 to \$21,000,000.

Activity	Implementing Partner	Award Number and Dates	Funding
Regional Citizen Security Activity - InfoSegura	UNDP	AID-596-IO-14-00001 May 30, 2014 – May 31, 2020	\$21,000,000.00

Within USAID's RDCS 2015-2019, InfoSegura contributes to Development Objective 3 "Regional Human Rights and Citizen Security Improved". Specifically, it contributes to intermediate result (IR) 3.1 "Regional capacity to address citizen security through more coordinated governance improved."

Under the U.S Strategy for Central America (CEN Strategy), InfoSegura contributes to the achievement of the Goal Two "Enhance Security and Reduce Levels of Crime and Violence" of the strategy's Pillar Two "Enhanced Security". Within the Alliance for Prosperity in the Northern Triangle (A4P), InfoSegura contributes to the A4P Line of Action Three "Improving Public Safety and Enhancing Access to the Legal System".

InfoSegura was designed to focus on strengthening evidence-based public policy in citizen security in six countries: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Belize, Costa Rica, and the Dominican Republic. However, implementation efforts have focused on the three Northern Triangle Countries. InfoSegura responds to the persistent lack of analysis and understanding of crime and violence – which has resulted in historically poor crime data, analysis and policy-making by governments. The lack of collaboration both by government and civil society to constructively engage to address these challenges has been another critical need.

To address these challenges, the activity has worked along the chain of information management (information collection, analysis, use and dissemination) to strengthen evidence-based policy-making on citizen security. This is achieved through: (1) improving regional and national capacity for collecting, monitoring and processing information regarding security, and its use in decision-making and policymaking at both levels; (2) strengthening civil society capacity for collecting, analyzing and processing information on citizen safety and monitoring policies and programs on citizen safety; and (3) supporting regional level knowledge management to enhance the understanding of fundamental causes of violence and insecurity and to promote successful policies and practices.

The design of InfoSegura included broadening partnerships through support for closer coordination between the General Secretariat of the Central American Integration System (SICA, by its acronym in Spanish), although this was dropped early in the program. National governments, civil society, and academic institutions, along with other key USAID bilateral and regional citizen security, migration, and human rights programs, have been key partners. The purpose of these partnerships was to build capacity of both government and civil society as major beneficiaries, while improving collaboration at the regional level. This helps to ensure that InfoSegura integrates with other activities (such as local-level crime prevention initiatives), or other critical regional themes (such as migration or human rights) to accelerate effectiveness.

InfoSegura includes two components:

- (1) Evidence based policy-making on citizen security increased.
- (2) Regional collaboration, knowledge management and networking on citizen security increased.

The two objectives under component one are:

1. **Quality and comparable citizen security indicators consolidated.** This objective will involve final investments at the country level to consolidate collection, monitoring and systematization processes of crime and security data. Key activities include developing key citizen security indicators that are comparable and disaggregated and to develop and support sustainable institutional capacity building plans – particularly within the Sub-Technical Units of Security Ministries, charged with citizen security policy to become permanent operating structures.
2. **Analytical capacity to Inform Citizen Security Policy Decisions Strengthened.** This objective will seek to strengthen both analytical and institutional capacities of key public institutions and civil society networks to provide evidence based analysis and policy recommendations to decision-makers on citizen security policy.

The two objectives under component two are:

1. **Improved dialogue between civil society and government institutions on citizen security issues.** Under this objective, civil society networks and platforms (which include an InfoSegura-backed Red de Conocimiento sobre Seguridad Ciudadana -CONOSE-¹) are developed and supported at both national and regional levels. These networks and platforms share analysis and advocate on major themes of citizen security, along with Alliance for Prosperity progress, with government partners and within civil society.
2. **Exchange of citizen security best practices and effective strategies increased.** This includes the promotion of expert exchanges of, evidence-based tools, forums and approaches from other countries to help Central America governments and civil society better tackle citizen security issues.

Since its inception, the most significant technical modification to the InfoSegura activity has been the ending in 2015 of planned support to the Regional Security Commission of SICA to construct a regional crime observatory – called OBSICA. Because of the lack of consensus in the Regional Security Commission, InfoSegura could not support the development of the OBSICA Regional Observatory and could not implement activities in Nicaragua. USAID/CAM and the UNDP subsequently re-directed the activity to focus support to the remaining seven countries of SICA, emphasizing national level development and close regional collaboration between these countries – with specific emphasis on the Northern Triangle – rather than

¹ CONOSE is integrated by higher education institutions, think tanks, and non-governmental organizations of Central America and the Dominican Republic aimed to promote and improve institutional capacities, professional competencies, and knowledge generation based on evidence of citizen security and peace. More information in Spanish can be found in www.conose.org

engaging any further with SICA.

C. Evaluation Questions

USAID/CAM has identified the following three main evaluation questions, **in priority order**. These should be answered by the Evaluation Team and clearly presented in the Final Report in terms of how they relate to the evaluation purpose. The Evaluation Team should answer the sub-questions separately in the report, and use the data collection and analysis of the sub-questions to answer the main questions.

The Evaluation Team should incorporate, to the extent feasible, analysis of possible differences associated with gender or social groups, particularly historically excluded groups (youth, people with disabilities, indigenous populations, etc.), and they should be reported separately for men and women. As an example, the Evaluation Team should consider gender and social group-disaggregated data when analyzing the capacity of the institutions to collect and use data.

1. *To what extent has InfoSegura contributed to change the level of quality² and timeliness of crime and violence data definition, collection, and recording in the region?*
 - 1.1 *To what extent has InfoSegura developed the capacity within the Sub-Technical Units (located within each country's respective Security Ministry) to collect, record, and use crime and violence data for analysis?*
 - 1.2 *To what extent has InfoSegura developed the capacity of source institutions (such as the National Civilian Police, the Attorney's General Office, and the Forensic Medicine Institute in El Salvador) to ensure quality of data and improve information sharing between source institutions and Sub-Technical Units?*
 - 1.3 *What is the potential that the capacity developed within the Sub-Technical Units and the source institutions remains or changes (increases or decreases) after the completion of InfoSegura?*
2. *To what extent have Central American governments used (as planned) crime and violence data- produced by InfoSegura and by other institutions that have received technical assistance under InfoSegura- as input to make effective citizen security-related policy decisions?*
 - 2.1 *What are the internal and external factors that foster or impede the Governments to use the data?*
3. *To what extent have the creation of partnerships and transparency (CONOSE) between government and civil society led to changes on national and regional collaboration on the design of citizen security policy?*
 - 3.1 *What are the internal and external factors that foster or impede the collaboration among the members of CONOSE?*

D. Evaluation Methodology, Data Collection, and Analysis

² Based on the best practices of the industry, the Evaluation Team needs to specify in the Evaluation Plan what criteria/methodologies/tools they will use to measure quality of crime and violence data and the justification for the selection of these criteria.

For the InfoSegura performance evaluation, a non-experimental mixed-methods design that combines a comprehensive, rigorous analysis of existing quantitative data with customized qualitative techniques designed to elicit primary data from a wide range of counterparts, partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders is recommended. This approach allows for triangulation of complementary data to elucidate linkages between activity inputs, outputs, and outcomes. The Evaluation Team should consider a range of possible methods and approaches for collecting and analyzing the data to address the evaluation questions thoroughly.

The use of participatory methods and activities that will enhance collaboration and dialogue among counterparts is required. Further, data collection and analysis methods should be sensitive to possible differences related to sex and/or social status, and should follow applicable Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidance on data security to ensure safety and confidentiality of all individuals providing data or information for the purposes of the evaluation.

The finalized evaluation method(s) and approaches, data collection plan and analysis will be included in the Evaluation Plan submitted to USAID for revision and approval before field visits and data collection begin (see Deliverables section below). The method(s) proposed should comply with the USAID Evaluation Policy.

The data collection plan for this evaluation will include, **at a minimum**: a desk review of relevant documents such as the cooperative agreement and work plans; review of activity performance monitoring and context data; key informant interviews and/or focus group discussions promoting equal participation of women and men; and direct observation through site visits. USAID/CAM expects both qualitative and quantitative data to be collected; and the results will be coded, triangulated and analyzed for content. The Evaluation Team is encouraged to propose additional/alternate data collection and analysis methods in the Evaluation Plan that could yield stimulating, robust evidence in answering each of the evaluation questions.

Data collection shall be systematic and data must comply with the five data quality standards of validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness. Specific interview, survey and/or focus group protocols will be appended to the Evaluation Plan and finalized with approval from USAID/CAM; the questions should be used to answer the evaluation questions listed in this document and address the purpose of this evaluation.

All data collected in response to the evaluation questions must have as much level of disaggregation as possible. As minimum, and per USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy, all people-related data must be disaggregated and analyzed by sex, as well as analyzed for any differences between effects on men and women or male and female participation.

- **Desk review of relevant documents**

USAID/CAM will provide the Evaluation Team with all relevant strategy and activity specific documents, such as the cooperative agreement between USAID and UNDP and its amendment(s) including the expected results, performance reports stating the results achieved, any prior assessments if applicable, etc. The Evaluation Team must review these documents and

other existing literature provided by USAID and others in preparation for the initial team planning meetings and before meeting with local stakeholders for interviews. The Evaluation Team is expected to conduct a contextual literature research and review, and create a Review Matrix to be delivered to USAID as part of the final Evaluation Report, indicating how key information extracted from reviewed documents and other methodologies were linked to each evaluation question.

At minimum, the Evaluation Team shall review the following documents relevant to the InfoSegura Final Performance Evaluation:

- Regional Development Cooperation Strategy 2015-2019 (Link [here](#))
- InfoSegura Description and Modifications
- InfoSegura Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- InfoSegura annual work plans
- InfoSegura biannual reports
- Evidence-Based Tools, Platforms, Studies and Reports used to address policy challenges: Regionally and Nationally
- CEN Strategy (Link [here](#))
- Plan of Alliance for Prosperity in the Northern Triangle (Link [here](#))

• **Review of performance and context indicators**

InfoSegura has an activity-specific Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan and has collected data on a number of standard and custom performance indicators during activity implementation. This monitoring data will provide one source of data on progress toward objectives and outcomes. The Evaluation Team will use monitoring data on performance indicators as part of the evaluation analysis and should report on it in the Final Report as much as it relates to the evaluation questions stated above and satisfies relevant data quality standards.

Context data should be analyzed and included to the maximum extent possible when answering the evaluation questions. The Evaluation Team must review situational analysis and the current list of 17 major crime indicators (broken down by major crimes groups) on citizen security that have been developed and improved for the Northern Triangle Countries as a result of InfoSegura actions, and how efforts to improve their analysis and comparison between countries are connected to the program results.

• **Key informant interviews, surveys, focus group discussions**

The Evaluation Team will interview stakeholders, through key informant interviews, group interviews, short surveys, and/or focus groups discussions. The Evaluation Team will include both men and women in the stakeholders' consultation processes. USAID/CAM and/or UNDP will provide key informant contact information once the evaluation begins.

At minimum, the Evaluation Team will interview:

- Key USAID/CAM staff (Agreement Officer's Representative -AOR- of the InfoSegura activity, alternate AOR of the InfoSegura activity, RDCS Development Objective 3 Team Leader, Democracy and Governance Office

- Director, among others) and Key USAID/Guatemala and USAID/Honduras staff (Offices Directors and/or bilateral activity managers)
- InfoSegura staff (InfoSegura Regional Leadership based in San Salvador and individual InfoSegura national teams in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras)
 - InfoSegura key partners: Central America Central and Local Governments³
 - El Salvador: Ministry of Justice and Security, General Directorate for the Social Prevention of Violence and Peace Culture (PREPAZ), Directorate of Information and Analysis (DIA), General Directorate of Statistics and Censuses (DIGESTYC), General Directorate of Prisons, National Civilian Police (PNC), National Council on Citizen Security, Secretariat for Governance, Ministry of Education (MINED), Technical Secretariat of the Presidency (SETEPLAN).
 - Honduras: Ministry of Security and its analytical and citizen security policy-making departments, Technical Unit for Institutional Coordination (UTECI), Secretariat of the Presidency, National Information Center for Social Sectors (CENISS), Studies and Analysis Center for Citizen Security (CEASCI), Local Government Support Unit (UGAGLO), municipal/department observatories selected in coordination with USAID/Honduras “Juntos en Acción por la Convivencia” activity and the Government of Honduras.
 - Guatemala: Ministry of Governance and its analytical and statistical department, Vice Ministry of Violence and Crime Prevention who coordinates the “Mesa Técnica Interinstitucional”, National Statistics Institute of Guatemala (INE), National Police, Unidad Para la Prevención Comunitaria de la Violencia (UPCV), select departmental observatories.
 - InfoSegura key partners: Civil Society Organizations/Academia
 - El Salvador: “Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo” Foundation (FUNDAUNGO), Cristosal, Organization of Salvadoran Women for Peace (ORMUSA), “Norma Virginia Guirola de Herrera” Institute of Women’s Studies (CEMUJER), Latin American School of Social Sciences (FLACSO, by its acronym in Spanish), and “José Simeón Cañas” Central American University.
 - Honduras: National Autonomous University of Honduras and its research wing on crime, the Association for a More Just Society, and FLACSO/Honduras
 - Guatemala: Rafael Landívar University, FLACSO/Guatemala
 - UN Country Teams and Agencies: UNDP, International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNWOMEN), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).
 - Other USAID Implementing Partners working in the citizen security field in the region through the implementation of regional activities (IOM, Pan-

³ InfoSegura only provides support to national level institutions (ministries, secretariats, etc.). Those institutions are the ones who reach the local governments who are indirect beneficiaries of InfoSegura.

American Development Foundation, and the John Jay University of Criminal Justice) or bilateral activities (Implementing Partners to be recommended by USAID/Guatemala and USAID/Honduras)

The Evaluation Team is encouraged to interview other bilateral donors and key stakeholders as needed involved with Citizen Security cooperation programs (namely Germany and Spain); multilateral donor partners such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank; and other actors that can provide an insight into USAID programmatic impacts.

A sampling plan describing the selection process (such as purposeful, random, or a combination of approaches⁴) for organizations and stakeholders for key informant interviews, surveys, and focus groups discussions (including sex disaggregation) is expected to be included in the Evaluation Plan and Final Report.

- **Site visits and direct observation**

In consultation with USAID/CAM and UNDP, the Evaluation Team will select relevant site visits based on a sampling plan developed for the Evaluation Plan and included in the Final Report. At minimum, the Evaluation Team should expect to visit the capital cities of each one of the three Northern Triangle countries of Central America where the Central Government institutions are located. In addition, when feasible and with the support of UNDP, the host country government, and USAID in each country; the Evaluation Team should identify and visit municipalities⁵ where the assisted institutions have applied the knowledge transferred through InfoSegura. Some examples of municipalities of interest to USAID are:

Guatemala

Metropolitan area of Guatemala (Guatemala City, Villa Nueva, Mixco) and Chimaltenango (53 miles from Guatemala City - asphalt road and dirt road)

Honduras

Tegucigalpa and San Pedro Sula (157 miles from Tegucigalpa – mostly asphalt highway to varying degree of quality)

El Salvador

San Salvador, Zacatecoluca (38 miles from San Salvador – high quality asphalt highway), and Colón (11 miles from San Salvador – high quality asphalt highway)

The Evaluation Team should plan to meet with USAID bilateral missions (USAID/Honduras and USAID/Guatemala) after being introduced by USAID/CAM to get feedback in the field since the Offices of Democracy and Governance (Guatemala and El Salvador) or Program Office/Democracy and Governance Office (Honduras) monitor and coordinate InfoSegura

⁴ Some sampling approaches include quota sampling, proximity sampling, convenience sampling, theoretical sampling, typical case sampling, etc.

⁵ National institutions assisted by InfoSegura have supported the local governments; therefore, it is expected that stakeholders at the local level who are indirect beneficiaries are not aware of the work of InfoSegura.

implementation with Mission efforts. When meeting key in-country representatives, the Evaluation Team may be accompanied by a member of USAID bilateral missions if Missions consider it appropriate. The Evaluation Team will be required to debrief USAID bilateral missions on field meetings or site visits, if so deemed appropriate. The purpose of the debriefing will be to share findings and receive comments or feedback prior to the preparation of the Draft Evaluation Report.

The Evaluation Team may attend events hosted or sponsored by InfoSegura during the fieldwork period of the evaluation to conduct direct observation. The Evaluation Team can use these events to talk with stakeholders, conduct interviews and collect additional data as evidence to answer the evaluation questions. USAID/CAM or UNDP will provide the Evaluation Team with a list of events once the evaluation begins.

Team planning meetings

An initial team-planning/ kick off meeting will be held in El Salvador between USAID/CAM and the Evaluation Team before the submission of the Evaluation Plan so that USAID/CAM can clarify any questions from the Evaluation Team, expectations, and guidelines. The expected results of this meeting are to:

- Clarify each team member's role and responsibilities
- Confirm the anticipated timeline and deliverables
- Discuss data collection tools and methodologies by evaluation question to be presented in the Evaluation Plan
- Identify communications logistics and how the Evaluation Team, USAID/CAM, and UNDP will communicate with each other

Additional meetings may be held as deemed necessary by USAID/CAM and/or the Evaluation Team.

E. Deliverables

It is estimated that not more than 70 working days of services from the starting date of the evaluation will be required to complete a high-quality evaluation as required under this SOW. During that timeframe, the evaluation team shall submit the following deliverables:

1. An **Evaluation Plan**, in Word Gill Sans font⁶ size 12, to be completed by the Evaluation Team after the Team Planning Meetings, no later than 15 calendar days after the starting day of the evaluation. USAID/CAM will receive the Evaluation Plan via electronic mail and review it to provide comments no later than 10 working days after receiving the document. The Evaluation Plan will provide details of how the various deliverables, tasks, and activities will be undertaken. It must include at least:
 - InfoSegura description and logic (change theory/development hypothesis);
 - Evaluation design⁷, and the explanation of why one design or mix of designs

⁶ If the Evaluation Team does not have Gill Sans family available, they must use any other approved font as per the USAID Graphics Manual and Partners Co-Branding Guide.

⁷ Some examples of evaluation designs for performance evaluations include snapshot design, cross-sectorial design, before-and-after design, time series design, case study design, panel design, etc.

proposed is the most appropriate, its limitations, and how these limitations will be addressed;

- A matrix summarizing the following information per each evaluation question:
 - Method(s) for data collection, data source, the explanation of why one method or mix of methods is the most appropriate, its limitations and the ways to address them;
 - Technique(s) for data analysis⁸, the explanation of why one analysis technique or mix of techniques is the most appropriate, its limitations and the ways to address them.
- Data Management Plan describing the capture of data (for example, interview notes or live recording), storage and transfer, and how all data will be handled in such a manner as to protect the identities of informants in any situations where their comments could potentially have a negative impact on their employment or security.
- Timeline and/or Milestone Plan, including tentative starting time for data collection and duration of each activity conducted under the evaluation;
- Drafts of data collection protocols, such as questionnaires or focus group moderator guide(s), interview scripts, consent form,⁹ etc.;
- Evaluation Team composition and roles;
- Location for the evaluation and Site visit plan.

If the Evaluation Plan includes key informant interviews, surveys, and/or focus group discussions, the Evaluation Plan should include the following information:

1. How the interviews/surveys will help to answer the evaluation questions
2. Who will conduct the interviews/surveys and why they are qualified to do so
3. What the rationale and methods are for deciding the number, timing, and location of the interviews/surveys
4. How the participants will be selected and recruited
5. How the interviews/surveys will be recorded
6. How the interview/survey data will be analyzed and presented

The Evaluation Plan, particularly the data collection and analysis protocols, as well as interview and focus group guides must be approved by USAID/CAM prior to the start of data collection and the field work. All interview protocols must be submitted in English and Spanish. The Evaluation Team will have another five (5) working days to make any changes. Once the Evaluation Plan is approved, the Evaluation Team will submit an electronic copy of it in PDF format to USAID/CAM. Any subsequent change to the Evaluation Plan must be approved by USAID/CAM. The Evaluation Team shall provide USAID/CAM and UNDP with a preliminary briefing on the Evaluation Plan prior to the beginning of data collection.

⁸ Some examples of data analysis techniques include parallel, conversion, sequential, multilevel, data synthesis, content analysis, etc.

⁹ If underage persons (less than 18 years old) will participate in this performance evaluation, the Evaluation Team must make sure to comply with all national regulations related to Child Protection.

2. **Brief weekly bullet reports of activities**, submitted by email to the manager of this evaluation every Monday by the close of business.
3. **A Preliminary Findings Briefing** for USAID/CAM (USAID/Guatemala and USAID/Honduras can join the briefing via video teleconference system), UNDP, and other stakeholders that USAID/CAM consider necessary on the preliminary findings identified by the Evaluation Team immediately after finalizing the data collection phase and before starting the draft report. According to the audience, the Draft Report briefing may be conducted in English or Spanish. Only the Team Leader needs to be present for this briefing; however, local/regional Evaluation Team members may also attend. The Evaluation Team will use the Preliminary Findings Briefing as a feedback exercise to prepare the Draft of the Final Report.
4. **A Draft of the Final Report** in Word, Gill Sans font size 12, submitted for review due no later than 60 calendar days after the approval of the Evaluation Plan via electronic mail. USAID/CAM will be responsible for distributing it to the implementing partner and other stakeholders for comments. USAID/CAM will consolidate all comments and send the draft back to the Evaluation Team within 10 working days. At a minimum, and in accordance with the USAID Evaluation Policy and Automated Directives System (ADS 201), the Final Report and its draft versions must include the following sections:
 - Executive Summary of the purpose, background, evaluation questions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations;
 - Evaluation purpose and questions;
 - Thorough description of the evaluation design and any challenge/limitations¹⁰, with emphasis on the timeliness and methods for data collection and data analysis;
 - Relevant data analysis tables;
 - Findings and conclusions drawn from the analysis of the findings¹¹;
 - Action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations with defined responsibility for the action;
 - A dissemination plan of findings, conclusions, and recommendations to intended users of the evaluation, and;
 - Appendices:
 - Original SOW, annotated with any changes approved by USAID
 - Evaluation and data collection team composition and roles, with conflict of interest disclosures for all real or perceived conflicts of interest, if necessary
 - Data collection protocols and instruments including questionnaires and checklists
 - Review matrix of documents consulted
 - Meeting notes

¹⁰ The Evaluation Team must identify (a) steps taken to mitigate limitations, and (b) how/whether the limitations affect any particular finding, conclusions, or recommendations.

¹¹ In moving from findings to conclusions, the analysis must be clear as to how findings are synthesized through different techniques such as divergence, convergence, and amalgamation; propensity; weighting; etc.

- Complete schedule of evaluation activities, meetings, and interviews
- List of individuals and organizations contacted and sites visited
- Tables, graphs, pictures taken during site visits, maps

USAID/CAM expects to receive a high-quality Draft Report from the Evaluation Team. USAID will assess the quality of it using the Evaluation Report and Review Template.

5. **Final Report** in PDF, font Gill Sans size 12, no longer than 40 pages in its body, excluding the cover page; Table of Contents; List of Acronyms; and Appendices. The approved Final Report must adhere to USAID's Evaluation Policy and ADS 201, Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report, and must be submitted in English and Spanish and have incorporated USAID's comments, as appropriate. The Final Report will be due to USAID 10 working days after the Evaluation Team receives comments on the draft. Five high-quality printed, bound copies in English and Spanish of the Final Report must be submitted to USAID within 10 calendar days of acceptance of the Final Report.
6. A **One-Page** summary of the evaluation purpose, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The One-Page summary will be prepared in English and Spanish in PDF.
7. Any **raw data** (qualitative or quantitative) collected in electronic form (DVD or flash drive, in original format of Word, Excel, etc.) is due no later than 100 calendar days after the starting date of the evaluation. As per ADS 579, the Evaluation Team must submit to the Development Data Library (DDL), in a machine-readable, non-proprietary format, a copy of any datasets that are used (or of sufficient quality) to produce an Intellectual Work.
8. One **event to present the content of the Final Report** for key Central Government representatives and other stakeholders in each of the three countries of the Northern Triangle (Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador)
9. **Other deliverables** as identified during the Team Meeting and agreed to by USAID and the Evaluation Team.

All reports and papers will be considered draft versions until they are approved by USAID. These draft documents must be labeled with the word "DRAFT" in watermark.

Findings must be presented as analyzed facts, strong qualitative and quantitative evidence and data, and not based on anecdotes, hearsay or the compilation of people's opinion. To ensure unbiased findings, there is no guarantee that findings will be modified based on USAID suggestions. The Evaluation Team will research, investigate, and corroborate as objective any suggestion before it is incorporated in the findings, and the change will be noted in the draft document so as to have a record of the change.

0.164.10
0521
7250
9/20

All submitted reports and presentations must be thoughtful, well-researched and well-organized documents, and objectively answer the evaluation questions. When writing the report, the Evaluation Team must remember the different audiences. The style of writing should be easy to understand and concise, while making sure to address the evaluation questions and issues with accurate and data-driven findings, justifiable conclusions and practical recommendations.¹² The Evaluation Team should clearly list any biases or limitations that exist during both data collection and analysis (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.). In addition, all real or possible conflicts of interest must be disclosed by each member of the Evaluation Team in writing.

When quoting an individual in any report, the Evaluation Team must always give the context or circumstances of the quote. Correcting a grammatical error in the quote may be valid, but not rewording an entire phrase. When translating quotes from one language to another, the Evaluation Team should do so in an idiomatic way and care must be taken to ensure that the tone of the translation is equivalent to the tone of the original. Quotes should be presented in their original language in report texts.

All reports must comply with the [USAID Graphic Standards Manual](#) and the [ADS Style and Format Guide](#). Once a Final Report has been approved by USAID, the Evaluation Team will make it compliant and submit it to USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse ([DEC](#)).¹³ The Evaluation Team will email USAID the DEC link where the evaluation reports. USAID/CAM may attach a Statement of Differences as an Annex to any Final Report if any differences remain in the final version.

F. Evaluation Management

Evaluation Team

This performance evaluation will use a combination of multidisciplinary international, regional, and local experts. The Evaluation Team must include at a minimum the following three positions:

Evaluation Team Leader

Minimum qualifications

Education: Master's degree in fields such as Criminal Justice, Criminology, International Crime and Justice, Crime Prevention, Political Science, or Public Administration (with a focus on criminal justice or crime prevention), Ph.D. or doctorate degree or professional with Doctoral candidacy is a plus. Formal training in monitoring and evaluation is a plus.

Language Proficiency: American English Level IV and Spanish Level III

Work Experience: At least 8 years of relevant prior experience conducting rigorous external evaluations using both quantitative and qualitative methods for development objectives and monitoring projects and programs overseas, preferably in Latin America. Experience in Central America is a plus. At least eight years of project management experience in development is

¹² For additional information on the criteria to ensure the quality of Evaluation Reports, see the [USAID's How-To Note "Preparing Evaluation Reports"](#), and Annex I of the [USAID Evaluation Policy](#).

¹³ Per ADS 540, documents and development assistance projects materials produced or funded by USAID must be submitted for inclusion in the DEC.

required. Experience with management of multidisciplinary teams is a plus. Familiarity with USAID's objectives, approaches, operations, and policies, particularly as they relate to evaluations is a plus.

Role: The Evaluation Team Leader will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating all activities related to this performance evaluation and for ensuring the production and completion of quality deliverables in a professional manner, in conformance with this SOW.

Data and Analytics Specialist

Minimum qualifications

Education: Master's degree in fields such as Economics, Statistics, Engineering, Social Research or other fields related to Data Analytics. Formal training in monitoring and evaluation is preferred.

Language Proficiency: Spanish Level IV and American English Level IV.

Work Experience: At least 5 years of progressively responsible, professional-level experience in statistics, data analytics and public administration and policy with a focus/specialization in crime prevention/criminal justice is a plus, with prior experience preferably in Central or Latin America. Familiarity with USAID's objectives, approaches and operations, particularly as they relate to evaluations is a plus.

Role: The Specialists will provide advice and analysis to the Evaluation Team Leader and will lead work on evaluating InfoSegura's work on data collection, comparison, analysis and communication. He/she should be highly experienced with statistics and data analytics, as they relate to public policy and criminal justice. Prior experience working on the issues in Central or Latin America is a plus.

Governance Specialist

Minimum qualifications

Education: Master's degree in fields such as Political Science, Law, Criminal Justice, International Crime and Justice, or Public Administration (with a focus on criminal justice or crime prevention and/or governance), with relations to development and/or public policy is required.

Language Proficiency: Spanish Level III and American English Level IV.

Work Experience: At least 5 years of progressively responsible, professional-level experience conducting evaluations related to public administration and policy, or good governance is required, preferably in Central or Latin America. Experience or knowledge of Central America's major governance challenges, particularly crime and violence issue is preferred. Some familiarity with USAID's objectives, approaches and operations, particularly as they relate to evaluations is a plus.

Role: The Specialist will provide advice and analysis to the Evaluation Team Leader and will assist the Evaluation Team Leader and the Data and Analytics Specialist with work on evaluating InfoSegura's work on public policy design, institutional development, governmental transparency and government-civil society collaboration on citizen security. He/she should be familiar with governance and public policy models as they relate to international development, along with governance and citizen security issues in Central America.

The Evaluation Team should have considerable experience in designing, monitoring, and evaluating development assistance programs. They must have proficiency in MS Office Suite and have excellent written, proofreading, and oral presentation skills and the ability to conceptualize and write clearly and concisely and attention to details. Understanding of the Latin American context is necessary, with a preference for personnel with work experience specifically in Central America. At least one key personnel member must have experience working in gender and social inclusion issues in a development context, transforming qualitative data, analyzing quantitative data, and producing data visualization in an easily digestible format.

All Team members will be required to provide in advance to USAID a signed statement indicating any conflict of interest, real or in appearance. The Team Leader must be external to USAID. No Evaluation Team member shall have been directly involved in the design and implementation of InfoSegura in any stage. Anyone who has directly employed by USAID or UNDP in the last five years must not be considered as part of the Evaluation Team.

Logistics

The Evaluator will be responsible for all logistics support under this SOW, including field office administration, all travel arrangements (with required USAID clearances), team planning facilitation and appointment scheduling, coordination with all partners and stakeholders involved, administrative services (computer support, printing and copying), report editing and dissemination, and for complying with provisions set forth in this SOW.

USAID/CAM will provide limited support to the Evaluation Team. This support, if needed, may include assistance in arranging high-level meetings; access to the U.S. Embassies compounds as necessary; and access to all reports, data, and other relevant documents created by InfoSegura.

USAID representatives may accompany the Evaluation Team for some or all the evaluation, especially in high level meetings. The Evaluation Team is expected to consider this when making logistical arrangements.

