**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**EVALUATION OF THE REGIONAL POLITICAL ANALYSIS AND PROSPECTIVE SCENARIOS PROJECT (PAPEP)**

1. **Purpose of the Evaluation.**

Since 2008, the second phase of the regional PAPEP has been managed and implemented by a project team based in Bolivia under Direct Implementation modality (DIM) with the operative support of the UNDP Bolivia CO. The project cycle is coming to an end (period 2008-2011). And the circumstance is perfect for an overall evaluation of the project in order to support the design of the new project document that should embrace the period 2012-2015.

During the period 2008-2011 on the one hand the project evolved strengthening its analysis and impacts capacities in LAC countries, and on the other hand it started generating the interest of other UNDP Regional Bureaus for its potential of application outside LAC with a south-south cooperation focus. At the same time, lately the regional PAPEP number of staff members was increased in order to count on appropriate human resources to respond effectively to the growing project’s implementation requests and challenges at regional and global level.

Since the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF) funds allocated to the PAPEP in 2009-2010 have been completely executed, and it is mandatory to undertake and complete a project evaluation at the end of project implementation, this evaluation will also include a final evaluation of those particular funds use. As a result a specific final evaluation report will be produced to be submitted to DGTTF management.

A comprehensive evaluation of the PAPEP will allow identifying and assessing the results achieved so far, lessons learned and main challenges to be addressed, as well as unforeseen circumstances and shortcomings that may have hindered the project implementation. The evaluation results will constitute valuable inputs, and provide analysis material to introduce changes and/or rearrangements for the future project cycle so to guarantee its continuous success and results. As per UNDP guidelines and policy for evaluations, all evaluations should be pitched at the outcome level. That is, it should be possible to obtain an indication of how successful the project has been in contributing towards the achievement of outcomes.

1. **Description of the Context.**

At the beginning of the XXI century the Latin American region was shaken by a series of serious institutional and political crises. That was the case of Paraguay in 2000, Peru in 2000, Argentina in 2001, Venezuela in 2002, Bolivia in 2003 and 2005 and Ecuador in 2000 and 2005. Of the eight crises, six ended up with the elected presidents resigning or being overthrown. Those events were motivated by a mix of economic crisis and governance failures. They did not represent an attack against the basic principles and values of democracy, but instead questioned the way those principles and values were applied. The social unrest was not against democratic governments but in support of better democratic governance, demanding more transparency and institutional effectiveness, an enhanced role of the state and more political participation.

In that regional context, which requested a thorough analysis and rethinking of political relationships, governance and legitimacy, the UNDP Bolivia Applied Human Development Report (HDR) Team working on the 2002 Bolivia HDR, started building the first long term prospective scenarios. The process involved multiple actors in order to promote a collective reflection on Human Development (HD) challenges in Bolivia. The exercise took place at a time when the country was facing a new presidential electoral process. Even though it was originally focused on the HDR, the findings led to multiple actors’ brainstorming on the political crisis, inflection and change through which Bolivia was passing and led to the creation of long term scenarios. That exercise fostered a series of high rank political debates involving the main presidential candidates and the report was brought to the centre of national politics.

At the same time, UNDP Honduras, during tense presidential elections, implemented a project whose aim was to promote political interlocution and dialogue between the key political actors in the country (2002). Both experiences underlined the importance of multiple actors’ political dialogue to be promoted through Political Analysis and, in the Bolivian case, adopted the prospective scenarios approach. However, they proved to have certain limitations such as the focus on structural analysis instead of current political situations, good analysis but no suggestions for action, and emphasis on a normative approach to politics (in the case of Bolivia); research’s methodological weaknesses and lack of structural analysis (in the case of Honduras).

Following those first experiences, it was decided to create specific methodological tools to carry out political analysis and elaborate mid and long term prospective scenarios to promote multi-stakeholder dialogue. That led to the development of the first PAPEPs, whose objective was to identify the most probable prospective scenarios in crisis situations and use them as a base for UNDP/UN internal analysis and planning, and to promote multiple actors’ debate on national priorities and solutions to crises. While the project was originally conceived for crisis contexts, today the PAPEP is being also implemented in countries that are not facing instability, where there is a need for analysis of a given public policy or national development project’s possible impacts, or simply where it is understood that thorough Political Analysis matters for multiple actors’ decision making.

The PAPEP aims at contributing to the strengthening of democratic governance in the region, at the same time the project represents a key instrument for crisis prevention and management. The PAPEP implementation allows developing situation reports and build short-medium term prospective scenarios, which are important inputs for the decision making processes of governments and/or other actors with influence on governance, in order to manage today’s democracies challenges. The project operates in a strategic dimension aiming at strengthening democratic institutions and national capacities for political management. That is achieved through providing development actors with analysis products leading to and fostering political interaction and dialogue.

During the period 2008-2011 the PAPEP through the production of prospective political analyses, the development of high level political debate networks at regional and lately at global level, and the implementation of training courses, pointed at achieving two complementary objectives in the countries where it operates: on the one hand, **strengthening development strategic actors capacities to face democratic governance challenges, and foster decisions allowing preventing (or at least managing) conflict or crisis scenarios affecting governance.** On the other hand, **strengthening and supporting the Resident Representatives (RRs) and Resident Coordinators (RCs) prospective political analysis capacities in order to support UN/UNDP strategic planning and foster conflict sensitive programmes design.**

That has been done through:

1. Support to and consolidation of PAPEP national teams
2. Development of prospective analysis and democratic governance strengthening networks of experts at regional and global level
3. Comparative Regional studies for strategic political analysis and advisory
4. Knowledge systematization and management
5. Capacity building in political analysis and prospective scenarios construction
6. **Description of the Subject of the Evaluation**

The following summarizes the framework of the Regional PAPEP within the Regional Programme Document for Latin America and the Caribbean, 2008-2011 (now extended to 2013):

KEY FOCUS AREA: DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

**The following are the formal regional programme outcomes and outputs.**

OUTCOME 3.1: Strengthened Dialogue and Participation, especially amongst women, children, youth, afro descendant people, and indigenous groups.

Shadow outcome[[1]](#footnote-1) 3.1. Widened awareness and debate on democracy and participatory public policies in favour of vulnerable populations and excluded groups

* OUTPUT 3.1.1: Analytical and quantitative tools to asses democratic governance at national and sub-national level

KEY FOCUS AREA: CRISIS AND CONFLICT PREVENTION

OUTCOME 3.3: Capacities of national institutions to manage crisis strengthened

* OUTPUT 3.3.1: Tools and Systems for political analysis and the construction of integrated frameworks for decision making.

EXECTUING AGENCY: UNDP

IMPLEMENTING OFFICE: UNDP Bolivia

FUNDING 2008-2011: TRACK: 909.621,43

BCPR: 950.000,02

AECID: 373.000,00

DGTTF: 69.999,43

1. **Evaluation Objectives and Scope**

It is expected that this final evaluation supports accountability to key counterparts and serves to identify the key lessons learnt for future planning and knowledge generation.

The evaluation should assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will identify the outputs produced so far (taking in account the project document 2008-2011), and the contributions to results at outcome level and positive changes produced along the way, including possible unexpected results. The evaluation is to identify the key lessons learnt and best practices.

For most of the objectives the evaluation will have a regional range. However at the same time it will carry out an in depth analysis of the project impacts in four countries where the PAPEP has been implemented in the last years: El Salvador, Peru, Honduras and Paraguay.

The evaluation pursues the following objectives:

1. Identify and assess the main results of the project as a tool for UN/UNDP enhanced capacity of prospective political analysis and strategic planning.
2. Identify and assess the main results of the project as a tool to strengthen democratic governance at national level.
3. Identify and assess the main results of the project in the promotion of south-south cooperation, and explore possibilities of future developments in this area.
4. Identify and assess the main outputs of the regional initiatives of the projects (comparative studies, workshops, publications).
5. Consolidate products and contributions to results at outcome level that might enrich capacity building and knowledge management, dissemination and uptake.
6. Provide clear forward-looking recommendations for future UNDP engagement in the thematic area concerned, replication of the project in other regions of the world, and for the drawing of the 2012-2015 project document.
7. **Evaluation questions.**

The Evaluation should respond at least to the following questions:

* To what extent the project has contributed to the results at outcome level?
* To what extent were the stated outputs achieved? And especially to what extent has the PAPEP contributed to:

1. Support to and consolidate the PAPEP national teams?
2. Develop prospective analysis and democratic governance strengthening networks of experts at regional and global level?
3. Produce comparative regional studies for strategic political analysis and advisory?
4. Carry out knowledge systematization and management?
5. Foster capacity building in political analysis and prospective scenarios construction?

* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outputs?
* How is the project useful for UN/UNDP top management in political analysis and strategic planning?
* Have UN/UNDP capacities in strategic planning been strengthened?
* How can be the project used as tool for UN/UNDP to deal with crisis prevention and management?
* What is the level of recognition and visibility of the project within UNDP RBLAC, and in other UNDP regional bureaus?
* Are the partnerships built along the project implementation appropriate and effective?
* What is national counterparts’ assessment of the project results (counterparts who have been involved in a PAPEP process)?
* What strategic development actors have been strengthened in facing DG challenges and preventing and managing conflicts and/or crises?
* What relevant inputs for UNDP has the project produced (innovative initiative, knowledge and networks building, south-south cooperation strengthening, UNDP visibility) to?

1. **Methodology**

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies and should embody a strong results-based orientation[[2]](#footnote-2). An outline of the evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.

It is recommended that the methodology to be used by the evaluator/s should include:

* Desk Study: Collection and review of documentation belonging to the PAPEP project. That includes: main conceptual documents, project document (2008-2012), missions final reports, financial reports, material produced during the project activities, and an independent project assessment paper produced by a senior political advisor familiar with the PAPEP work and activities.
* Survey to UNDP regional COs top management (RRs, RCs, DG Directors).
* Semi-structured interviews with key counterparts in evaluation focus countries (Peru, Paraguay, El Salvador, Honduras) and UNDP staff where the PAPEP was carried out. (At least three UNDP officers: including RR, DG Cluster Director, DG Programme Officer involved in the PAPEP process).
* Interviews with evaluation focus countries key national actors and counterparts (at least three high ranking political actors who have been involved in the PAPEP process).
* Interviews with UNDP potential partners outside LAC on south-south cooperation potentials.
* Interviews with Regional PAPEP and PAPEP COs’staff.

Interviews will be carried out through telephone/skype, but in certain cases field missions will be required (Peru, Honduras, Paraguay, El Salvador).

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation[[3]](#footnote-3), and should describe critical issues the evaluator must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation. This includes evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers. The evaluator is expected to sign the Ethical Code of Conduct of the UN Evaluations[[4]](#footnote-4).

The evaluation above detailed should begin in the first half of October 2011. The work time is expected to be 2 months, and the evaluation report final version delivery is expected to be around mid December 2011.

The number of recommendations resulting from the evaluation should be limited (no more than 10), and well based on the evaluation findings and conclusions.

1. **Expected Products**

The key evaluation products the evaluator will be accountable for producing are:

* Evaluation inception report: this should be prepared before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: methods, sources of data and data collection procedures. This report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. This inception report provides the Project team and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation scope and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.(The Inception Report should not be longer than 10-15 pages)
* Draft evaluation report.
* Final evaluation report structured according to the template provided for in the UNDP handbook (Annex 7). (Max. 40 pages without annexes, in English)

1. **Evaluation Consultant Skills and Experiences**

* Professional degree or 5 years of experience in evaluation processes
* Relevant experience in evaluation processes for the UN System/UNDP
* Relevant professional experience in the area of democratic governance and/or conflict transformation
* Knowledge and/or experience with UNDP
* Knowledge and/or experience with international donor
* Relevant experience in project evaluation
* Relevant experience in “soft assistance” (advocacy, policy advice) project evaluation
* Excellent analytical skills
* Excellent writing skills in English and Spanish
* Relevant work experience in Latin America
* Interpersonal skills

1. **Implementation Arrangements**

The Deputy Coordinator and the Coordinator of the PAPEP will be the main contact for the evaluator as well as the main provider of the initiative´s institutional memory. Substantive and financial information will be provided by the Administrative-Financial Assistant. The Deputy Coordinator and a research assistant will be in charge of reviewing the Draft Evaluation Report and uploading the Final Report specific to the DGTTF funding 2009-2010 to the DGTTF online site. The Deputy Coordinator, in coordination with the Coordinator, will be in charge of reviewing the Draft Evaluation Report and approving the final report.

The project will provide the evaluator/s with all documents, substantive and financial reports, a list of interviewees (both within UN/UNDP and national actors/counterparts), and the evaluation report template and quality standards.

The Regional PAPEP coordinator will be in charge of approving the final evaluation report. The Deputy Coordinator, together with the financial-administrative assistant and other staff members support, will liaise with the evaluator providing operational support, access to information, and support to contact the interviewees.

1. **Time frame for the evaluation process**

***The following time frame is tentative and might change slightly during the evaluation implementation. Also the countries targeted for field missions may change depending on local COs needs/interests to participate to the evaluation process.***

* Desk review and Inception Report: 7 days
* Field missions: Bolivia, 2 days; Peru, 3 days; Paraguay, 3 days; Honduras, 3 days; El Salvador, 3 days.
* Telephone interviews with other relevant stakeholders: 5 days
* Elaboration of the draft report: 7 days.
* PAPEP revision of draft report and comments: 7 days.
* Final Report: 7 days.
* Devolution of the evaluation results to the key stakeholders: 2 days.

**ANNEX I:**

**Preliminary list of Documents to be consulted**

* **UNDP´s Strategic Plan 2008-2011 (extended to 2013) and its MTR**
* **Regional Programme Document for LAC 2007-2011**
* **Mid Term Evaluation of the RP**
* **PRODOC 2008-2011**
* **Award documents (BCPR, DGTTF, AECID)**
* **Annual financial and achievements reports**
* **Current methodological toolkit**
* **Methodological toolkit (work in progress)**
* **El Salvador 2009 documents**
* **Paraguay 2009 documents**
* **Peru 2011 documents**
* **Honduras 2010 documents**
* **Other case studies documents (if needed)**
* **The PAPEP Experience “Strengthening political capacities for development”**
* **Web page spanish/english**
* **Regional publications/material (produced up to date)**

**ANNEX II: PRODOC 2008-2011 (including Results Framework)**

1. These “shadow outcomes” are proposals to redefine the existing RP outcomes as they were originally formulated in relatively vague manner [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The proposed methodology should be in line with the UNDP Manual for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009): <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>, UNDP outcome level evaluation guidance, and norms and standards for UN evaluations: <http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21> and http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\_id=22. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [**http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct**](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)