"PARTICIPATORY POLICYMAKING AMONG TARGETED GROUPS IS PROMOTED" Outcome Evaluation, UNDP Armenia, 2008

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the Government of Armenia has undertaken a number of measures against corruption. In particular, in 2003 the Government drafted and adopted the RA Anti-Corruption Strategy and its Action Plan. The RA Anti-Corruption Strategy defines corruption, with a particular focus on wide public participation in the fight against corruption, setting out the main priorities and emphasizing the significance of monitoring anti-corruption measures. A number of bodies to fight and prevent corruption have been created. The country has joined international anti-corruption initiatives and bodies. Armenia signed the UN Convention against Corruption on May 19, 2005 and ratified it on March 8, 2007.

Armenia's Anti-Corruption Strategy is mainly oriented towards the improvement of corruption prevention interventions, newly created institutions and the legal framework. In the framework of the Strategy, numerous pieces of legislation were adopted (more than 50 laws and regulations), new institutional structures were created, the country has joined reputable international organizations combating corruption (GRECO and OECD Anti-Corruption Network for Transition Economies), as well as signed and ratified international agreements and conventions against corruption (Council of Europe Civil Law and Criminal Law Conventions Against Corruption, UN Convention Against Corruption), etc.

Several structures are working on combating and prevention of corruption. Pursuant to a Presidential decree of June 1, 2004, an Anti-Corruption Council headed by the Prime Minister was established. According to the rules of procedure of the Council, a Monitoring Commission for the Implementation of the Anti-Corruption Strategy was setup under the leadership of the Assistant to the President. An Anti-Corruption Department was established at the Prosecution. At the same time, respective structural divisions of the Police and the National Security Service established specialized anti-corruption units.

UNDP Armenia's contribution is provided through Country Program Outcome 4: Improving the transparency and accountability of Government Institutions in accordance with the MDGs and PRSP. Its second outcome statement is: Participatory policymaking among targeted is promoted. The outputs of three projects contribute to this outcome.

a. "Support to Information Society and Democratic Governance" (Project Number: 0011255)
b. "Civil Society Monitoring Nat'l Strategy on Anti-Corruption" (Project Name: 00043615)
c. "Strengthening Awareness and Response in Exposure of Corruption in Armenia" project started in 2006 and on-going. The project is aiming at improving transparency and accountability of government institutions in Armenia through strengthening the institutional capacity of government and civil society organizations to effectively participate in anti-corruption initiatives and to monitor the implementation of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy. The project is implemented in cooperation with Government of Armenia.

Purpose and subject of the evaluation

The evaluations of UNDP Armenia's **Country Programme Outcome 4**: "Participatory policymaking among targeted groups is promoted" is to be conducted as the issue of citizen's participation is critical for development of democracy in Armenia in general, and particularly for overcoming problems like corruption. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the outputs of the projects and their contribution to the outcome, their relevance to the country, as well as to define lessons learned and identify possible future entry points for similar projects. An evaluation of the ICT project and an internal review of Anti-Corruption project 1 were conducted in 2006. Thus it is recommended that these reports be reviewed and that the evaluation should concentrate on "Strengthening Awareness and Response in Exposure of Corruption in Armenia" project.

Objectives and scope of the evaluation

The objective of the outcome evaluation is to assess how the outputs of the above projects contribute to the specified outcome, as well as to assess their linkages with national priorities on governance. The timing of this outcome is strategic to identify results and define lessons learned which will assist in informing future interventions as part of the CP review and planning cycle.

The evaluation will review the extent to which program, projects, soft assistance, partners' interventions and synergies among partners have contributed to the achievement of the outcome. Thus it will include five categories of analysis:

This outcome evaluation will address the following questions

Design:

- How did the outcome statement affect the design of the projects?
- What were the substantive design issues? (stakeholder/partner involvement and capacity, parallel work by other agencies, UN management capacity, sustainability, etc.)
- To what extent and in what ways were past experience, findings from evaluations, dialogue with stakeholders, etc. used to design the projects?

Outcome Status:

- What is the status of the key outputs, particularly for project (c above)?
- Were the outputs realistic?
- In what ways can progress towards outcomes be observed?
- What were the major factors contributing to progress toward outcomes? (UNDP interventions, CSO partnerships, other donors, government, etc.)
- What UNDP interventions can be linked to progress toward outcomes?
- What are the major sustainability issues?
- What needs to be done to address these?
- What unintended changes (positive or negative) occurred?

Relevance:

In what ways was the design and implementation of the projects relevant to:

- A-C issues in Armenia
- Government of Armenia priorities (Equality, etc.)
- UNDP programming
- Work of other donors
- Constraints and opportunities in current environment

UNDP Contribution

- What innovative approaches were tried and capacities developed through UNDP assistance?
- How were UNDP crosscutting issues mainstreamed in the projects? (Gender equality, CD, etc.)

Evaluation duration

Planning phase: 5 days
Preparatory work, field work and feedback: 19
Drafting and finalizing report: 5 days

Geographic coverage: To be determined but will include field visits

Evaluation Methodology:

While selecting the methods of evaluation that fact needs to be considered that outcomes are influenced by a full range of UNDP activities (projects, programmes, non-project activities and "soft" assistance within and outside of projects) as well as the activities of other development actors. Thus, a number of variables beyond the projects need to be considered during the evaluation. More specifically evaluation methodology is to be defined be the evaluator. The evaluator is expected to use all relevant methods to obtain data and information for the analysis and drawing up of findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. The possible methods include:

a) Documentation review: Review of MYFF/Strategic Plan of UNDP for a description of the intended outcome, the baseline for the outcome and the indicators and benchmarks used. Examine contextual information and baselines contained in project documents, the Country Programme, Common Country Assessment/United Nations Development Assistance Framework (CCA/UNDAF), corresponding project documents, their evaluation reports and other sources;

b) Interviews, field visits, questionnaires and meeting including participatory forums to validate information about the status of the outcome that is culled from contextual sources; also use to the extent possible the data collected and analysis undertaken by the country office prior to the outcome evaluation; and examine local sources of knowledge about factors influencing the outcome;

Stakeholders to be involved in the evaluation: Will be defined jointly by UNDP and the evaluator*.*

Products Expected from the Evaluation:

A Final Report, which covers, at least:
- *Assessment of progress made towards the intended outcome*
- *Assessment of achievement of outputs*
- *Lessons learned concerning best / or less ideal practices in producing outputs and achieving the outcome*
- *Strategies and recommendations for continued UNDP assistance towards the achievement of the outcome, and while addressing the issue in future programming.*

The outcome evaluation report should be written in English and include the following:
- Title Page
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Table of contents, including list of annexes
- Executive Summary
- Introduction: background and context of the programme
- Description of the program – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
- Approach and methodology
- Findings
- Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons, generalizations, alternatives
- Annexes

Composition, skills and experience of the evaluation expert
1. At least 15 years of related professional experience at international level;

2. Ability to analyse problems, make recommendations and present proposals for improvement or change in policies and procedures;

3. Strong experience in dealing with policies and practices in the area of anti-corruption in other countries (Eastern European/CIS countries preferable);

4. Excellent knowledge on anti-corruption best practices;

5. Knowledge of regulatory and institutional framework of the country, and of governance, civil society in Armenia is an asset;

6. Knowledge of integrative anti-corruption approaches supporting equality between men and women

7. Strong background in developing assessment reports, conducting research etc;

8. Openness to new ideas, ability to express ideas clearly and concisely, both orally and in writing, demonstrated initiative, tact and high sense of responsibility and discretion;

9. Excellent communication and teamwork skills, ability to negotiate with the government and non-governmental and international entities;

10. Capacity to take initiative and good judgment in understanding of her/his responsibilities;

11. High level of integrity, professionalism and respect for diversity and gender

12. Fluency in English is a must

Plan for evaluation implementation

a) The UNDP Country Office has appointed an Evaluation Focal Person that will be responsible for the evaluation mission.
b) The modalities of carrying out the evaluation have been agreed to between the Country Office and the Evaluation consultant in an initial planning mission. This included:

- Finalization of this ToR for the outcome evaluation;
- Agreement on the methodology and approach;
- Identification and provision of the key documents needed for evaluation;
- Identification and addressing all the controversial and problematic issues;
- Identification of key stakeholders;
- Agreement on the evaluation questions;
- Agreement of the schedule for completing the evaluation in May as well as the draft and final evaluation reports.

c) A wrap up meeting will be held in UNDP Armenia prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission. The consultant will give a presentation of the initial evaluation findings and recommendations.
d) The Evaluation consultant will forward a Draft Report of the Evaluation to the Resident Representative, UNDP Armenia within three weeks of completion of the evaluation mission.
e) The Final Report will be sent within one week following the receipt of feedback.

Annexes. The following documents are appended to this TOR and will be provided to the evaluator:
- Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report
- Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP
- Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators