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)” 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.

UNDP Peru has been selected for an ICPE since its country programme will end in 2021. The ICPE will be conducted in 2021 to feed into the development of the new country programme. The ICPE will be conducted in collaboration with the Government of the Republic of Peru, with the UNDP Peru Country Office, and with the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean.

The Global COVID-19 pandemic has presented UNDP with considerable challenges in implementing its ongoing programme of work in line with the CPD. Even more so than usual, UNDP has been required to be adaptable, refocusing and restructuring its development work to meet the challenges of the pandemic and Country’s need to effectively prepare, respond and recover from the wider COVID-19 crisis, including its socio-economic consequences. This ICPE will also consider the level to which UNDP was able to adapt to the crisis and support country’s preparedness, response to the pandemic and its ability to recovery meeting the new development challenges that the pandemic has highlighted, or which may have emerged.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT
The Republic of Peru is a very diverse country with three regions, the Coast, the Andes, and the Amazon. The population of Peru is estimated at 32.6² million people in 2020, of whom 79.3 percent live in rural

areas\(^3\), and 24 percent define themselves as indigenous\(^4\). Peru’s capital, Lima, is overpopulated with 33 percent of the total population\(^5\).

**Socioeconomic situation, poverty, and inequality:** The Peruvian economy has undergone structural changes in the last decades. After the 1980s hyperinflation, debt crisis, and fiscal imbalance, in mid-1990, Peru started to recover through a stabilization program implemented by the government\(^6\). This program and favourable external conditions, such as the improvement of trade terms, led to the country’s fiscal consolidation and institutional reform to halt the inflation\(^7\). Since 2000, Peru experienced economic expansion, public investment, and reduction in poverty and income inequality. In addition, Peru engaged with the Organisation for the Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2008. Since then, Peru has been implementing the OECD program for admission as a member. However, between 2014 and 2019, Peru’s economic growth fell off due to a decrease in the price of copper, Peru’s principal export commodity, and the economic slowdown of key partners\(^8\). As a result, the gross domestic product (GDP) went from growing by 5.8 percent in 2013 to rising by 3.3 percent in 2015\(^9\). In 2018, the GDP grew 4.0 percent after the economy recovered from El Niño Costero phenomena and the Lava Jato corruption case\(^10\). This recovery was the result of the growth of domestic demand, private investment, and consumption\(^11\).

Despite being an upper-middle income country\(^12\) and ranking 79th out of 189 countries in the Human Development Index\(^13\) (above the Latin American average), Peru still suffers from poverty and inequality. In 2019, approximately 20.2 percent of the population lived in poverty and 2.9 percent in extreme poverty\(^14\). Inequality measured by the Gini coefficient was 41.5\(^15\).

**COVID-19 pandemic:** Peru’s strict measures to combat the pandemic, such as stay-at-home orders, curfews and border closures, had a severe economic impact on the country. According to the Central Reserve Bank, in the third quarter of 2020, the GDP decreased by -9.4 percent due to the reduction in household consumption (-9.3 percent), the fall in gross fixed investment (-10.2 percent) and the decline of exports of goods and services (-25.6 percent)\(^16\). Peru’s labour market was also hit by the pandemic. The country’s unemployment rate increased from 3.6 percent in 2018 to 8.8 percent in the second quarter of 2020, and the informal employment stood at 75.2 percent in the third quarter of 2020\(^17\) against 67.7 before the pandemic. Informal employment which represents more than half of the economically active population could not abide by quarantine measures.
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\(^3\) National Institute of Statistics and Informatics. 2017 Census, Peru  
\(^7\) Inter-American Development Bank Group. Country Strategy with Peru (2107-2021)  
\(^9\) Ibid.  
\(^11\) Ibid.  
The pandemic has exposed the health care crisis in the country. While Latin America and the Caribbean’s average expenditure on health was 8.0 percent of its GDP, Peru’s expenditure was 5.2 percent\(^\text{18}\). 1,019,475 cases and approximately 37,830 deaths from COVID-19 were reported by the end of 2020\(^\text{19}\).

**Gender:** The female population in Peru represents 50 percent of the total population\(^\text{20}\). Social classes and ethnic origin in Peru play a key role in determining women’s access to resources and their position in society. In addition, misconceptions about gender roles in society and at home pose challenges to achieving gender equality. Peru’s gender inequality index was 0.395 in 2019, ranking it 88th out of 162 countries\(^\text{21}\). In the 2020 Global Gender Gap Report, the country ranks 66 out of 153 countries, positioning it at 17 out of 25 countries in the Latin America and the Caribbean region\(^\text{22}\).

In a context of economic and social inequality, female participation in the labour market (59.4 percent) is lower than men (40.6 percent)\(^\text{23}\). According to the National Institute of Statistics, women earn 29.6 percent less than men since women work fewer hours as they take care of their children\(^\text{24}\). Women are vulnerable to poverty. Five out of ten women are in poverty in Peru\(^\text{25}\). Regarding their occupations, 58.4 percent of poor women participate in the labor market, and 25.3 percent are dedicated to the household\(^\text{26}\).

Gender-based violence is a serious problem in Peru. In 2018-2019, 38.3 percent of women between 15 and 49 years old suffered some type of violence\(^\text{27}\), and in 2018, 150 women were victims of femicide, which represents an increase of 4 percent compared to 2015\(^\text{28}\). In light of the COVID-19 quarantine, which caused a massive increase in gender-based violence due to women being enclosed with their aggressors, the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations, through the National Program ‘Aurora’ for the prevention and eradication of violence against women and family members, has been providing care to women, children, and adolescents victims of violence\(^\text{29}\). With regard to the Political Empowerment subindex\(^\text{30}\), Peru ranks 31 out of 153 countries, with 26.2 percent of seats held by women in the National Assembly in 2020\(^\text{31}\), which is below the average of 32.9 percent of women in parliaments in Latin America and the Caribbean\(^\text{32}\).

**Government and justice system:** The Republic of Peru has had a highly unstable political history including human rights violations and corruption. From 1980 to 1990, democracy was challenged by the debt crisis and the internal armed conflict caused by a revolutionary communist party and terrorist organization, the Shining Path. The death toll from political violence in Peru between 1980 and 2000 is estimated to be more
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\(^{21}\) UNDP. Human Development Report, Gender Inequality Index, 2019.


\(^{26}\) Ibid.


\(^{32}\) The World Bank Data, proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments.
than 60,000 people\textsuperscript{33}. The political crisis culminated in the election of an outsider, Alberto Fujimori, in 1990, and then his self-coup in 1992\textsuperscript{34}. Under Fujimori’s government, the constitution was suspended, the congress was closed, and the leader of the Shining Path was capture leading to political peace reinstatement. In 1995, Fujimori was re-elected for a second term, and in 2000 for a third term. However, the discovery of a network of corruption forced Fujimori to resign.

After a transitional government and 2001 elections, the governments within the 2001-2018 period restored some degree of democracy and economic development. However, due to their implications in corruption cases, such as the Lava Jato, and human rights crimes, the four appointed presidents (2001-2018) have either been sent to jail or are fugitives from justice\textsuperscript{35}. President Martin Vizcarra’s government, which started in May 2018, attempted to reform the political and justice system, however he faced extreme opposition from Congress which exacerbated the governance crisis. Due to corruption allegations, according to Transparency International’s 2019 Corruption Perceptions Index, Peru was 36/100, seven points lower than the global average of 42\textsuperscript{36}, and the severe economic impact of the management of the pandemic, Peru’s congress impeached the president. The president of the congress replaced president Vizcarra for less than a week since politicians forced the interim president’s resignation after nationwide protests. On November 2020, Peru’s congress appointed Francisco Sagasti as interim president. General elections will be held on April 11, 2021.

\textbf{Venezuela human right crisis}: By the end of 2020, it has been calculated that Peru is hosting approximately 1.1 million Venezuelans, including approximately 490,000 asylum-seekers\textsuperscript{37}, the highest in the region. In an effort to regularize the Venezuelans immigration status, in 2017, the government established a temporary residency permit for Venezuelans who legally entered Peru\textsuperscript{38}. However, with the growth of arrivals, the Peruvian government has adopted measures to restrict the entry of Venezuelans into the country. Socio-economic integration remains a challenge.

\textbf{Environment and natural resources}: Peru is the fourth largest rainforest country in the world\textsuperscript{39}. Approximately 60 percent of the Peruvian territory is covered by the Amazon rainforest, which is one of the most biodiverse areas of the world. Peru holds more than 20,375 species of flora, 2145 species of fish (1\textsuperscript{st} in the world), 1847 birds (3\textsuperscript{rd} in the world), and more than 4500 species of potato\textsuperscript{40}. However, unsustainable development practices threaten already fragile ecosystems, including natural and social capital. The Ministry of Environment is currently developing the National Adaption Plan (NAP) to reduce the risks of climate change. Deforestation, land use change, and habitat loss threat Peru’s biodiversity and ecosystem. Migratory agriculture is the main driver of deforestation. In 2019, the Ministry of Environment through the ‘Forests Program’ has been able to decrease the deforestation level in the Amazonian region by 4.1 percent compared to 2018\textsuperscript{41}.

As a signatory of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Peru reported on national greenhouse gases inventories, and national programs with mitigation and adaptation actions against climate change. In the Climate Ambition Summit 2020, the President of Peru reaffirmed the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{37} UNHCR. Global Focus, Peru. https://reporting.unhcr.org/peru
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country’s commitment to the Paris Agreement and pledged to decrease carbon emissions to 30-40 percent by 2050, with the objective that the Peru becomes a carbon neutral country by 2050\(^{42}\). Peru is also vulnerable to natural disasters, including earthquakes, volcanoes, and landslides, and climatological events due to its location. In 2017, El Niño Costero flooding affected over 1.5 million people, caused 162 deaths, and damaged hundreds of thousands of homes\(^{43}\).

3. **UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN PERU**

UNDP’s cooperation with Peru began in 1961 with the signature of the Model Basic Assistance Agreement, which constitutes the legal basis for the relationship between the Government and UNDP. The work carried out by UNDP in the country during the period of review of this evaluation is guided by two documents:

- The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2017-2021, which was developed by the UN country team in Peru composed of 24 agencies, in coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- The Country Programme Document (CPD) for 2017-2021, which was developed in accordance to the priority areas identified in the UNDAF and addresses four outcomes of UNDP’s corporate strategic plan 2018-2021. All outcomes in the CPD are aligned with the National Strategic Development Plan and sectoral plans, as well as with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The UNDP country programme document for Peru was designed to contribute to the following programme priorities:

1. inclusive and sustainable growth and development;
2. social protection and quality basic services;
3. institutions and transparency; and
4. citizenship and peace.

The principal focus of the CPD is to contribute to the sustained eradication of extreme poverty and significant reduction of inequality by addressing overarching development challenges that are linked to national priorities of OECD accession. UNDP’s CPD was developed to contribute to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. Estimated resources for the four-years CPD amounted to US$ 250.0 million, as presented in table 1.


Table 1: UNDAF\textsuperscript{44} outcomes to which the CPD planned to contribute in the period 2017-2021\textsuperscript{45}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDAF outcome</th>
<th>UNDP Country Programme outputs</th>
<th>Indicative resources ($)\textsuperscript{46}</th>
<th>Expenditures as of 6 January 2021\textsuperscript{47}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National priority:</strong> 2021 Peru Bicentennial Plan. Competitive economy with high employment and productivity; Sustainable use of natural resources; Balanced regional development and adequate infrastructure. SDGs: 1, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13-16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDAF Outcome 1:</strong> By 2021, people living in poverty and vulnerability improve access to decent livelihoods and productive employment by means of sustainable development that strengthens social and natural capital, integrating an adequate management of risk.</td>
<td>Output 1.1. National and subnational capacities strengthened to implement policies, plans or other instruments of sustainable and inclusive development. Output 1.2. National and subnational capacities strengthened for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, mitigation and adaptation to climate change. Output 1.3. National / subnational systems and institutions enabled to achieve structural transformation of productive capacities that are sustainable and employment- and livelihood-intensive.</td>
<td>$458,500</td>
<td>$99,541,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National priority:</strong> 2021 Peru Bicentennial Plan. Equal opportunities and access to services. SDGs: 1, 5, 10, 11, 16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDAF Outcome 2:</strong> By 2021, people living in poverty and vulnerability improve their access to quality,</td>
<td>Output 2.1. National and subnational capacities enhanced for social protection and access to basic services for people living in poverty. Output 2.2. Access to justice and citizen security improved for people living in conditions of poverty vulnerability and discrimination.</td>
<td>$458,500</td>
<td>$49,541,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{44} UNDAF for Peru 2017-2021. \url{https://peru.un.org/48770-marco-de-cooperacion-de-las-naciones-unidas-para-el-desarrollo-en-el-peru-2017-2021}

\textsuperscript{45} Source: UNDP CPD for Peru (2017-2021)

\textsuperscript{46} Indicative resources from the CPD 2017-2021 results and resources framework

\textsuperscript{47} Source of Expenditures: UNDP data extracted from Atlas / PowerBi as of 6 January 2021. The allocation of projects by outcomes will be validated by the CO. The revised expenditure figures will be presented in the evaluation report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDAF outcome</th>
<th>UNDP Country Programme outputs</th>
<th>Indicative resources ($)(^{46})</th>
<th>Expenditures as of 6 January 2021(^{47})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>universal basic services and to an inclusive system of social protection that allows them to exercise their rights and to have fair access to development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National priority</strong>: 2021 Peru Bicentennial Plan. Efficient and decentralized government at the service of citizens and development. SDGs: 1, 10, 16, 17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UNDAF Outcome 3: By 2021, public management is more efficient, effective, transparent and equitable, thus increasing the confidence of the people in institutions. | Output 3.1. National and subnational capacities in public management strengthened to increase efficiency and effectiveness and comply with international commitments.  
Output 3.2. Strengthened transparency access to information and accountability.  
Output 3.3. National and subnational capacities strengthened for implementation of 2030 Agenda. | $ 458,500 | $ 49,541,500 | $ 34,505,910 |
| **National priority**: 2021 Peru Bicentennial Plan. Full observance of fundamental rights and dignity of persons; Equal opportunities and access to services; Efficient and decentralized government at the service of citizens and development. SDGs: 16 | | | |
| UNDAF Outcome 4: By 2021, people living in poverty and vulnerability improve their exercise of freedoms and rights in a | Output 4.1. Government capacities improved to address international human rights obligations especially those related to people living in conditions of vulnerability and discrimination.  
Output 4.2. Enhanced participation mechanisms promoting dialogue and social peace and greater social representation. | $ 458,500 | $ 49,541,500 | $ 10,628,974 |
### 4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

ICPEs are usually conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme to contribute to the process of developing the new country programme. Thus, the ICPE will focus on the current programme cycle (2017-2021), covering the period of 2017-2021, to provide forward-looking recommendations as input to UNDP Peru’s formulation of its next country programme.

ICPEs focus on the formal UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board. The country programmes are defined – depending on the programme cycle and the country – in the Country Programme Document (CPD). The scope of the ICPE includes the entirety of UNDP’s development programmes in the country, including those projects running from the previous cycle into the current one. The interventions under review are funded by all sources, including those from UNDP’s regular resources, donors, and the Government. The efforts supported by UNDP’s regional and global programmes will also be included. It is important to note that a UNDP county office may be involved in several 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

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria.

The ICPE will address the following key evaluation questions. 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. To what extent has UNDP been able to adapt to the COVID-19 pandemic and support country’s preparedness, response and recovery process?
4. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP’s performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

---

48 ICPE Peru is an exception and will start on the last year of implementation of the CPD.
50 The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria.
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. 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 outputs and the extent to which these outputs have contributed to the intended CPD outcomes. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes will also be identified.

UNDP support to country’s preparedness, response and recovery process to the COVID-19 pandemic will be addressed in question 3 by analysing UNDP’s programme adaptation to the COVID-19 situation, the relevance of UNDP’s support to the country including its alignment to national policies and other UN agencies and donors interventions as well as by assessing the effectiveness of the support provided and the sustainability of results achieved.

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 4. 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), the 2016 change management process which entailed changes in the office structure and staffing, and the integration of gender equality and women’s empowerment in design and implementation of the CPD are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.

Special attention will be given to integrate a gender-responsive and intercultural focus to the evaluation approach to data collection methods. The evaluation will analyse the extent to which UNDP (country) support was designed to and did contribute to gender equality and will consider the gender marker and the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES). The GRES, developed by IEO, classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative (see schematic below). In addition, gender-related questions will be incorporated in the data collection methods and tools, such as the interview questionnaire, and reporting.

---

51 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).
IEO will employ a rating system for all ICPEs starting in 2021. The rating system was first piloted in 2020 and is currently being refined. Details will be provided in due course prior to the implementation of the ICPE.

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. A preliminary assessment was carried out to identify the evaluable data available as well as potential data collection constraints and opportunities. The Evaluation Resource Center (ERC) information indicates that sixteen project/programme evaluations were conducted as part of the current programme cycle. Three outcome evaluations were cancelled.

With respect to indicators, the CPD Outcomes, UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) and the corporate planning system (CPS) associated with it provide indicators, baselines and their status of progress. To the extent possible, the ICPE will use these indicators and data, as well as other alternative indicators which may have been used by CO, to interpret the UNDP programme goals and to measure or assess progress toward the intended outcomes. However, the CPD indicators try to assess aspects of performance that are well-outside of UNDP’s direct sphere of control, and for which the programme has limited influence. To mitigate these limitations, the evaluation will work with Theories of Change to try to estimate goals and map assumptions against the expected and achieved results. In addition, primary data collection will be restrained by the COVID-19 restrictions and the virtual nature of the consultation. In response to these constraints, the evaluation team will expand the number of interviews as well as recruit national expertise and/or consultants familiar with Peru context and challenges.

Data collection methods. The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of corporate and project documentation and surveys. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed, and telephone/zoom interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, UNDP country office and RBLAC and beneficiaries of the programme. Efforts will be made to collect views from a diverse range of stakeholders on UNDP’s performance. At the start of the evaluation, a stakeholder analysis will be conducted with the support of the CO to identify relevant UNDP partners to be consulted, 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 will include:

- Programme coverage (projects covering various components, joint projects 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 regions);
- Maturity (covering both completed and active projects);
- Programme cycle (coverage of projects/activities from the past and the current cycle);
- Degree of “success” (coverage of successful projects, projects where lessons can be learned, etc.).

The IEO and the Country Office will identify an initial list of background and programme-related documents and post it 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 quality assurance reports available. A pre-mission questionnaire will be administered and expected to be completed at least two weeks prior to the virtual data collection consultation.

All information and data collected from multiple sources and through various means will be triangulated to ensure its validity before the evaluation reaches conclusions and recommendations. An evaluation matrix will be used to guide how each of the questions will be addressed to organize the available evidence by key evaluation question. This will also facilitate the analysis process and will support the evaluation team in drawing well-substantiated conclusions and recommendations.

In line with UNDP’s gender equality strategy, the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all the CO programmes and operations. Gender-related data will be collected by using corporately available sources (e.g. the Gender Marker) and programme/ project-based sources (e.g. through desk reviews of documents and interviews), where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

**Stakeholder involvement:** a participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with multiple stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the initial phase, a stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to 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.

7. **MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

**Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP:** The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Peru country office, the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Government of Peru. 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 Peru:** 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, complete the pre-mission questionnaire and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The CO will provide support in kind (e.g. scheduling of interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries). 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 debriefing, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through
a videoconference, where findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will be presented. Once a final draft report has been prepared, the CO will prepare a management response to the evaluation recommendations, in consultation with the RB. It will support the use and dissemination of the final ICPE report at the country level.

**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 the final stakeholder debriefing. Once the evaluation has been completed, the Bureau is also responsible for monitoring the status and progress of the country office’s implementation of the evaluation recommendations, as defined in its management response.

**Evaluation Team:** The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. The IEO team 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 Lead Evaluator (ALE):** IEO staff member with the general responsibility to support the LE, in particular during the data collection and analysis, consultants management and the preparation of final report. Together with the LE, the ALE will help backstop the work of other team members.
- **Research Associate (RA):** IEO internal consultant in charge of supporting the LE in the preparation of terms of reference, background research, data collection and analysis and the final report.
- **Consultants:** two external consultants will be recruited to collect data and help to assess the outcome areas, paying attention to gender equality and women’s empowerment. Under the guidance of the LE and the ALE, they will conduct preliminary desk review, develop a data collection plan, prepare outcome analysis papers, conduct data collection, prepare sections of the report, and contribute to reviewing the final ICPE report.

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

| Table 2: Data collection responsibilities (tentative) |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| **Area** | **Report** | **Data collection** |
| Outcome 1 | LE/ALE Consultant 1 | Consultant 1 + ALE |
| Outcome 2 | LE/RA + Consultant 2 | Consultant 2 + RA |
| Outcome 3 | LE + Consultant 2 | Consultant 2 + LE |
| Outcome 4 | LE + Consultant 2 | Consultant 2 + LE |
| Gender equality | LE + RA | All |
| Strategic positioning issues | LE + ALE | LE + ALE |
| Operations and management issues | LE + ALE | LE + ALE |

**8. EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process as outlined in the ADR Methodology Manual. The following represents a summary of key elements of the process. Four major phases provide a framework for conducting the evaluation.

**Phase 1: Preparatory work.** Following the initial consultation with the country office, the IEO prepares the ToR and the evaluation design, including an overall evaluation matrix with specific evaluation questions. Once the TOR is approved, additional evaluation team members, comprising international development
professionals with relevant skills and expertise will be recruited. The IEO, with the support of the country office, collects all relevant data and documentation for the evaluation.

**Phase 2: Desk analysis.** Evaluation team members will conduct desk review of reference material and identify specific issues. Further in-depth data collection will be conducted, by administering a pre-mission questionnaire to the Country Office. Based on this, detailed questions, gaps and issues that require validation during the data collection phase will be identified.

**Phase 3: data collection.** The evaluation team will engage in data collection activities and start virtual consultations. The estimated duration of the mission will be 4-5 weeks. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 5 with responsibilities outlined in Section 7. At the end of the mission, the evaluation team may hold a debriefing presentation of the key preliminary findings at the Country Office. By the end of the mission, all additional data gaps and areas of further analysis should be identified for follow-up.

**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 first draft of the report will be subject to peer review by IEO and an external reviewer. 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 Peru 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. Considering the discussion at the stakeholder event, the final evaluation report will be produced.

**Phase 5: Publication and dissemination.** The ICPE report, including the management response, and evaluation brief 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 Peru Country Office 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 for Latin America and the Caribbean will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the ERC.
9. **TIME FRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS**

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively\(^{52}\) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in September 2021 (tentative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: Preparatory work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of other evaluation team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Desk analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre mission questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and preliminary findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft ICPE for CO/RB review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft shared with the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft management response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final debriefing with national stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5: Production and Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and formatting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{52}\) The timeframe is indicative of process and deadlines and does not imply full-time engagement of the team during the period.