

# TERMS OF REFERENCE

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Office (EO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is conducting a series of evaluations known as Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) with the goal of obtaining and demonstrating evidence of UNDP's contribution to the development results at the country level. The ADRs are carried out within the framework of the general provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.<sup>100</sup> The overall objectives of an ADR are to:

- Provide significant support to the Administrator's role of accountability in its report to the Executive Board.
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the country where the programme is implemented.
- Serve as an instrument to ensure the quality of UNDP interventions at the country level.
- Contribute to learning at the corporate, regional and national levels.

The EO plans to conduct an ADR in Paraguay in 2010. This evaluation will contribute to the formulation of a new country programme, which will be prepared by the country office in question, together with national stakeholders.

## 2. NATIONAL CONTEXT AND UNDP PROGRAMME

Paraguay is home to 6.2 million inhabitants. With an income level of US\$2100 per capita (2008), the country is classified as lower-middle income. It is also a country with a medium level of human development, according to the UNDP Human

Development Index (0.761 in 2007), ranking 101 out of a list of 182 countries. In Paraguay, the prevalence of poverty increased from 33.7 percent in 1999 to 41.4 percent in 2003 (the extreme poverty rate in that period rose from 15.5 percent to 20.1 percent), and then dropped in 2007 to 35.6 percent (with a modest reduction of extreme poverty to 19.4 percent). The high level of inequality in income distribution is reflected in its high Gini index: 53.2.

The period covered by this evaluation (2003-2010) witnessed two presidential administrations: that of Nicanor Duarte (2003-2008) and that of Fernando Lugo (2008 to present), whose election broke the domination that the Colorado Party had enjoyed since 1947.

In the same period, UNDP adopted two strategic documents: the Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) for the 2002-2004 period, which was extended until 2006, and the Country Programme Document (CPD), covering the 2007-2011 period.

The 2002-2004 CCF identified five priority areas for UNDP: a) human development and poverty reduction; b) democratic governance and state modernization; c) environmental management; d) international competitiveness, economic integration and development of the productive system; and e) information technology and communication for development.

The CPD for 2007-2011 mentions certain lessons learned from the previous programming. In particular, it highlights the need for greater programmatic focus and further development of national capacities. It also notes reduced demand from the

---

100 <[www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf)>

national government for resource management through UNDP (a trend that continues to the present). In order to keep the programme more focused, UNDP chose only three programmatic areas: a) poverty reduction and sustainable human development; b) governance and modernization of the State; and c) environmental management.

It should be noted that the United Nations System in Paraguay approved two Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF) for cooperation with the country during the 2002-2006 and 2007-2011 periods, respectively, with a recent emphasis on the importance of reducing duplication and enhancing synergies by working on joint projects.

### **3. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY**

The objectives of the Paraguay ADR are to:

- Provide an independent assessment of progress towards achieving the expected results as outlined in UNDP programming documents. The ADR will also highlight unexpected results (positive or negative) and missed opportunities, as appropriate.
- Provide an analysis of how UNDP has positioned itself to add value in its response to national needs and changes in the national development context.
- Present key findings, draw out key lessons learned and provide a set of recommendations so that the administration can make adjustments to the current strategy and in the next country programme.

The ADR will review the UNDP experience in Paraguay and its contribution to solving political, economic and social challenges. The evaluation will cover the current and previous country programme (2002-2004 and 2007-2011). Although it is likely to put greater emphasis on more recent interventions (due to increased data availability, etc.), efforts should be made to examine the development and implementation

of UNDP programmes since the beginning of the period. Existing evidence for evaluation and potential limitations will be identified during the preparatory mission (see section 5 for more details of the process).

The methodology as a whole must be consistent with the ADR Guidelines and the new methodological ADR Methods Handbook. The evaluation will undertake a comprehensive review of UNDP programmatic activities and portfolio during the period under review, specifically examining UNDP's contribution to national development results across the country. It will evaluate key outcomes, specifically the effects – whether planned or unforeseen, positive or negative, deliberate or involuntary – and will cover UNDP assistance financed both with its own resources and with supplemental resources.

The evaluation will have two main components: analysis of results by thematic area and the strategy of UNDP in the country.

#### **ANALYSIS OF RESULTS BY THEMATIC AREA**

Evaluating the effects of development will include a thorough review of the UNDP programme portfolio for the current and previous cycle. This includes an evaluation of development results and UNDP's contribution in terms of key interventions; progress toward the achievement of outcomes through the current country programme; factors influencing results (UNDP positioning and capacities, alliances and support for policy formulation); and UNDP's achievements, progress and contribution to thematic areas (both in policy and advocacy); analysing cross-sectional ties and their relationship to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the UNDAF. The analysis of development results will identify challenges and strategies for future interventions.

In addition to using available information, the evaluation will document and analyse achievements against expected results, and ties between activities, outputs and outcomes. The evaluation

will establish UNDP's contribution to outcomes with a reasonable degree of probability.

The following are core criteria related to the design, management and implementation of interventions in the country:

**Relevance at a thematic level:** How relevant is the formulation of interventions in the different areas with respect to national strategies, development challenges and UNDP's mandate? Are approaches and resources for projects rooted in national and international 'good practices'? Are resources provided to achieve the desired objectives?

- *Effectiveness:* Has the UNDP programme met the objectives that were sought and outcomes that were planned? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme? Have there been any unexpected results? Should it continue in the same direction or should its fundamental principles be revised for the new cycle?
- *Efficiency:* Has UNDP used its resources (human and financial) well in making its contribution? What could be done to ensure more efficient use of resources in the specific national or subregional context?
- *Sustainability:* How sustainable is UNDP's contribution? Are development results achieved through UNDP's contribution sustainable? Are the benefits of UNDP interventions sustainable? Have stakeholders appropriated those benefits once UNDP's involvement comes to an end? Has any exit strategy been developed?

It should be stressed that special efforts will be made to examine UNDP's contribution to capacity development, knowledge management and gender equality.

Some specific foci to touch on in the case of Paraguay are:

- Use of national and regional 'good practices' in the formulation of UNDP interventions, given that there are similar experiences and lessons to be learned in other countries in the region;

- The role of 'resource management' in the UNDP programme: institutional effects, achievements, weaknesses and risks, and a perspective of disengagement over the medium and long term;
- Thematic concentration of the UNDP portfolio; clarity of focus in each subject area;
- UNDP contributions on key and urgent issues, such as employment, extreme poverty and the environment;
- UNDP capacity to translate analytical studies (Human Development Report and other outputs from the Office of Human Development, Investing in People project) in programmes focused on key issues.

#### ANALYSIS AT THE STRATEGIC LEVEL

The evaluation will assess the strategic positioning of UNDP, both from the perspective of the organization as well as from the country's development priorities. This will include: a) a systematic analysis of UNDP's place and niche within the field of development and policy formulation in Paraguay; b) the strategies used by UNDP-Paraguay to strengthen its position in the field of development and to position the organization within the core thematic areas; and c) an assessment of support for policy formulation and advocacy efforts of the UNDP programme in relation to other stakeholders, from the perspective of development results for the country. Also, it will analyse a set of key criteria relating to the strategic positioning of UNDP:

- *Strategic relevance and responsiveness:* Role of UNDP in leveraging national strategies and policies, balance between macro-level interventions (central government, national policies) and micro-level interventions (communities, local institutions). UNDP capacity to respond to a changing national context, to emergencies and to urgent demands from its partners. Likewise, its ability to maintain its focus on substantive issues without losing its strategic direction.

- *Using networks and capitalizing on experiences:* To what extent did UNDP make use of its global network and their specific experiences and knowledge to provide solutions to problems and conceptual approaches? To what extent did UNDP draw on the experiences of its current and potential partners (resources, technical capacities)? To what extent did UNDP assist the Government in taking advantage of opportunities for South-South cooperation?
- *Promotion of United Nations values from the perspective of human development:* The role of UNDP as a substantive partner to national authorities in the dialogue on policies and on politically sensitive issues. UNDP's contribution to gender equity. UNDP's capacity to address equity issues in general, including its ability to focus on the poor and marginalized groups and sectors.
- Links between 'macro' interventions at the level of strategies and central state institutions, and subnational and community-level interventions;
- Balance and links between cooperation with the State and with civil society. This issue will pay particular attention to national policy interventions from the perspective of indigenous Guaraní.

The evaluation will also consider the influence of administrative constraints on the programme and, more specifically, on the contribution of UNDP (including issues related to the relevance and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation). If these constraints are considered important during the initial analysis, they should be included in the scope of the evaluation.

In the case of the UNDP Office in Paraguay, issues regarding financial resources, organization of the programme area and internal monitoring and evaluation systems could be elements that are relevant to understanding results at a programmatic and strategic level.

Within the context of partnerships with the United Nations System and, in general, coordination of the United Nations, the evaluation will highlight the specific issue of developing joint programmes.

In the Paraguayan context, the following are of particular note: a) progress in terms of reducing programmatic duplication and improving synergies in the United Nations System; b) progress in terms of common use of financial and human resources in a context of limited resources belonging to each organization within the system; c) UNDP leadership in the new issue of coordinating international cooperation (not only within the scope of the United Nations).

Some specific questions to be addressed in the case of Paraguay:

- UNDP's capacity to adapt to a change of government without losing its long-term strategic foci;
- UNDP cooperation with the three branches of government (executive, legislative and judicial) in order to support consistency in the adoption of public policies and programmes;
- UNDP contributions to the development of capacities and instruments used by the organization: What tools does UNDP use? (Resource management, support for policy development, support for the creation of new units in the public administration, support for infrastructure and information technology, training, educational missions).<sup>101</sup>

---

101 The evaluation will benefit from the inputs provided by a case study in Paraguay, carried out in parallel by the UNDP Evaluation Office in the context of a thematic evaluation of UNDP's contribution to the development of national capacities.

## 4. METHODS AND FOCI OF THE EVALUATION

### DATA COLLECTION

The evaluation will use a multi-methodological approach to data collection that may include document review, workshops, individual and group interviews (both at headquarters and in the UNDP country office), project visits and field visits and surveys. The set of appropriate methods may vary depending on the country's context; its precise nature can be defined during the exploratory mission and detailed in the inception report.<sup>102</sup> It will be very important to ensure that information is organized and processed according to principles of qualitative data analysis.

### VALIDATION

The evaluation team will use a variety of methods, including triangulation, to ensure that data are valid. The specific validation methods will be detailed in the inception report.

### INVOLVEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS

The evaluation will identify key stakeholders, including representatives of government ministries and agencies, civil society organizations, representatives of the private sector, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors and beneficiaries. To facilitate this approach, all ADRs will include a stakeholder mapping process, which should include both UNDP direct partners and others that do not work directly with this organization.

## 5. EVALUATION PROCESS

This evaluation will follow the Guidelines for the ADR, according to which the process can be divided into three phases, each with several stages. The process will be carried out independently, as

required in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. The Evaluation Office will make every effort to engage the local UNDP office and national government authorities actively in the evaluation process.

### PHASE 1: PREPARATION

**Document review.** Initially conducted by the EO (identification, collection and mapping of documents and other relevant data) and continued by the evaluation team. The review will include general documentation on development regarding the specific country, along with a complete picture of the UNDP programme during the reporting period.

**Mapping of stakeholders.** A basic mapping of stakeholders with relevance for the evaluation in the country. The list will include government and civil society stakeholders and should go beyond traditional UNDP partners. The exercise will also indicate the relationship between different groups of stakeholders.

**Initial meetings.** Interviews and discussions at UNDP headquarters with the EO (process and methodology) and the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (country context and programme), as well as other important offices, including the Bureau for Development Policy, the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, and any others deemed appropriate, including UN missions.

The assessment will require three missions:

- 1. Initial mission. Mission to Paraguay (five days) to:**
  - Discuss the evaluation objectives and process with UNDP country office and national authorities.
  - Identify options to involve national authorities more actively, respecting the principles of independence.
  - Interview and select local consultants.

---

<sup>102</sup> The preparatory mission and inception report are described in section 5 on the evaluation process.

## 2. Preparatory mission. Mission to Paraguay (one week) to:

- Identify and gather additional information.
- Validate the mapping of the programmes implemented in the country.
- Select a sample of UNDP development projects and activities.
- Identify key partners and informants and prepare an interview programme for the main mission.
- Get the viewpoints of stakeholders on key issues to be considered.
- Deal with logistical issues related to the main mission, including scheduling.
- Identify the appropriate set of methods for collecting and analysing data.
- Address management issues related to the rest of the evaluation process, including the division of labour among team members.
- Ensure that the country office and key stakeholders understand the objectives, methodology and process for the ADR.
- *Inception report.* This phase will involve the development of a short inception report that includes the design and the final plan for the evaluation, background for the evaluation, key issues to be evaluated, a detailed methodology, information sources, data collection tools and plan, design and analysis of data and report format.

3. **Main ADR mission.** The independent evaluation team will conduct a mission of approximately 25 days, centred on data collection and validation. An important part of this process will be an introductory workshop which will explain the ADR objectives, methods, and process to stakeholders. The team will visit places where significant projects selected in the preparatory mission are implemented on the ground.

Upon completion of the main mission, a *workshop with key partners* will be organized in order to present the

initial findings of the mission and receive comments to be taken into account in drafting the report.

## PHASE 2: DEVELOPMENT AND PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT ADR REPORT

**Analysis and report.** The information gathered will be analysed in a draft ADR report to be completed within one month following the departure of the evaluation team from the country.

**Review.** The draft report will be subject to: a) a technical review by the EO and external peer review; b) factual corrections and opinions regarding interpretation from key clients (including the UNDP country office, the regional office, and the national government). The EO will prepare an audit trail to show how they have considered these comments. The team leader, in close collaboration with the EO task manager, will finalize the ADR report based on inputs received.

## PHASE 3: FOLLOW-UP

**Management responses.** The UNDP Assistant Administrator shall request the appropriate units (usually the country office and the regional bureau in question) to prepare a management response to the ADR. As the unit exercising supervision, the regional bureau will be responsible for monitoring and supervising the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

**Dissemination.** The ADR report and summary will be distributed both in electronic and printed form. The evaluation report will be available to the Executive Board when it comes time to approve a new Country Programme Document. It will also be widely distributed in Paraguay and at UNDP headquarters and copies will be sent to evaluation offices of other international organizations, as well as evaluation associations and research institutes in the region. In addition, the evaluation report and management response will be posted on the UNDP website<sup>103</sup> and available to the public. Its

---

103 <[www.undp.org/eo](http://www.undp.org/eo)>

availability will be announced by UNDP and through external networks.

## NATIONAL PARTNER

Although the evaluation is performed as an independent exercise under the UNDP Evaluation Policy, it must be ensured that the national partner is informed of it, and has the opportunity to state to the Evaluation Office what they are interested in learning from the evaluation and indicate issues keys that should be taken into account in it. It is also important that the national partner be able to comment on the intermediate outputs and the draft evaluation report.

With respect to the traditional ADR process, certain additional items are recommended:

- 1) UNDP's formal counterpart, the Chief of the Civil Cabinet and Coordinator of the Social Cabinet of the Office of the Presidency, will be asked to form a National Reference Group for the ADR that includes the main government institutions involved in the UNDP programme.<sup>104</sup>
- 2) The terms of reference for the evaluation will be forwarded to the National Reference Group for comment.
- 3) During the preparatory mission, a consultation meeting with the National Reference Group will be organized. This meeting will be used to obtain additional input on key issues that should be reflected in the evaluation.
- 4) The National Reference Group will be invited to propose a candidate for the role of ADR external independent adviser. The adviser will not be a member of the evaluation team. This person's role is to provide independent comment on the quality of the evaluation report and its relevance to national development issues relevant to UNDP.
- 5) At the conclusion of the main mission, a workshop to discuss the initial results will be organized. The ADR National Reference Group will chair the workshop and discuss the initial results.
- 6) The National Reference Group will provide written comments on the draft evaluation report.

## 6. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

### UNDP EO

The UNDP EO task manager will administer the evaluation and ensure coordination and liaison with the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, other headquarters units affected, and the administration of the UNDP Office in Paraguay. The EO will hire a research assistant to facilitate the initial review of documents and a programme assistant to support logistical and administrative matters. The EO will cover all costs related to the conducting of the ADR. This will include costs related to participation of the team leader, international and national consultants, as well as the preliminary investigation and the publication of the final ADR report. The EO will also cover the costs of any stakeholder workshop to be held as part of the evaluation.

### THE EVALUATION TEAM

The team will consist of three (or four) independent consultants:

- The team leader (international), whose overall responsibility is to provide direction and leadership, and to coordinate the draft and final reports.
- Two (or three) national consultants, who will contribute their expertise on the central themes of the evaluation and will be responsible for

---

<sup>104</sup> According to an initial discussion, in addition to the Coordinator of the Social Cabinet, the National Reference Group should include the following institutions: 1) Ministry of Finance; 2) Technical Secretariat of Planning; 3) Secretariat of the Civil Service; and 4) the Technical Unit for Modernization of the Public Administration.

drafting some key parts of the report. Each national consultant will be responsible for a thematic area of the programme.

The team leader must have proven ability in strategic thinking and consulting on policy formulation and in the evaluation of complex programmes in the field. All team members should have a thorough knowledge of development issues, and the national consultants should be aware of the development challenges in Paraguay. These roles also require expertise in the subject of evaluation, preferably in qualitative analysis techniques.

The evaluation team will be supported by a research assistant based in the New York Evaluation Office. The EO task manager will support the team in the design of the evaluation mission, will participate in the initial mission and in the final phase of the main mission and will provide continuous feedback to ensure quality during the preparation of the initial and final reports. Depending on need, the task manager may also participate in the main mission.

The evaluation team will orient its work according to the Evaluation Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group and will adhere to its Code of Ethical Conduct.<sup>105</sup>

## COUNTRY OFFICE

The country office will support the evaluation team in maintaining contact with key partners and will provide the team with all necessary information regarding UNDP's activities in the country as well as help organize meetings with stakeholders at the end of the evaluation process. The office will also be asked to provide logistical support to the evaluation team, as requested. The country office will provide support in kind (e.g., office space for the evaluation team, Internet connectivity), but the EO will cover local transportation costs and other costs related to the evaluation mission.

## 7. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The expected outputs are:

- An inception report (maximum 15 pages: design, methodology, evaluation process).
- A main analytical report (evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations) for the ADR (maximum 50 pages of text, plus annexes).
- A two-page evaluation summary.
- The draft and final report of the ADR will be provided in Spanish. The published document will be also translated into English.

---

<sup>105</sup> The guidelines of the United Nations Evaluation Group 'Norms for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System', April 2005.

**Table A1. Provisional timetable**

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Tentative date</b>
Terms of Reference to the UNDP country office, RBLAC and the National Reference Group	Mid-May 2010
Comments	29 May
Preparatory study	May 2010
Preparatory mission*	7-11 June
Draft inception report to EO	19 June
Inception report sent to the UNDP country office, RBLAC and the National Reference Group	26 June
Main mission in Paraguay	12 July-4 August
Thematic technical reports sent to the Head of Mission and EO	18 August
First draft sent to EO	31 August
Draft sent to reviewers	15 September
Comments from reviewers	23 September
Draft sent to the country office and RBLAC	30 September
Written comments from country office and RBLAC	19 October
Teleconference with EO, CO, RBLAC (if necessary)	25 October
Revised report sent to the Government through the country office	3 November
Written comments from the Government	24 November
Report completion	7 December

\* Includes a meeting with the National Reference Group