Executive Summary

Background

In 2012, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the Organization of American States (OAS) entered into a second three-year Cooperation Plan, also known as CIDA-2, to address issues in the areas of socio-economic development, trade and elections administration in the Latin America and Caribbean region, as well as to strengthen capacities at the General Secretariat of the OAS.

This report presents the Evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2012-2015.

Evaluation Methodology

The objectives of the evaluation were to evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of CIDA-2, in addition to assessing the delivery of the main outputs, the immediate and intermediate outcomes of all projects, and the contributions to the ultimate outcome of CIDA-2.

The evaluation was guided by an evaluation matrix. Methods included interviews with 146 stakeholders, a review of key documents, a portfolio review of all 20 projects included in the Cooperation Plan, and country visits to Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, and Peru. The objective of these missions was to conduct consultations that would ensure that information came from a wide and representative mix of stakeholders. While El Salvador was not visited for security reasons, the evaluation team did carry out virtual consultations by telephone and Skype.

The main limitations to this evaluation were gaps in monitoring data available on CIDA-2 intermediate and ultimate outcomes.

Context

During the sixth Summit of the Americas in Colombia in 2012, Former Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced Canada's commitment to economic growth and development in the Americas. This pledge led to the development of the Cooperation Plan for 2012 to 2015 and a grant from CIDA of CAD 19.5 million to the General Secretariat of the OAS. This was the second Cooperation Plan between the two organizations. CIDA-2 encompassed five areas of intervention, including democracy, business environment, access to markets, gender equality instruments, and institutional strengthening of the OAS.

Relevance

CIDA-2 showed high relevance at the country level and in addressing the priorities of the Government of Canada and the OAS mandates. All stakeholders consulted in the countries visited considered CIDA-2 activities highly relevant to them and their organizations. The Cooperation Plan was well-aligned with the national development plans of OAS Member States and the evaluation showed high relevance in the areas of “business environment” and “access to markets” for which all countries had established as national priorities. However, the criteria used to select participating countries and beneficiaries were inconsistent and projects were often supply-driven.

For Canada, CIDA-2 was relevant and directly linked to each of the three priorities in the Government of Canada’s Strategy for Engagement in the Americas, which places high importance on economic prosperity, democracy

and fostering lasting relationships. The document review found strong alignment between CIDA-2 projects and Canadian priorities in 19 of the 20 projects of the Cooperation Plan. Moreover, the evaluation found that all CIDA-2 projects had a justification and rationale clearly linked to an OAS mandate. However, given the multiple OAS unfunded mandates and its limited financial and human resources, CIDA-2 projects tend to have more relevance in areas where the OAS is recognized as a major player, where it has expertise and technical capacity.

**Effectiveness**

The evaluation of CIDA-1 criticized the Cooperation Plan for the absence of an overarching results framework or performance measurement framework and for the output-oriented nature of the projects. Accordingly, CIDA-2 developed a comprehensive performance measurement framework and improved the RBM skills of the General Secretariat staff involved in CIDA-2 projects. All CIDA-2 projects had results frameworks with indicators at the output and outcome levels. Staff involved acquired some skills in managing for development results and gained greater awareness of the benefits of managing through an RBM approach. In this way, CIDA-2 led to some institutionalization of an RBM culture in the General Secretariat. However, considerably more work is needed in this regard and evidence of outcome achievement in CIDA-2 remained anecdotal due to lack of data. The main issues noted were poorly specified or overly ambitious outcomes and indicators, and the lack of baseline data and theory of change.

While CIDA-2 delivered approximately 73 per cent of its outputs, it does not appear likely that the Cooperation Plan will achieve its intermediate nor its ultimate outcomes. Overly ambitious outcome statements, lack of follow-up and the dispersion of resources across many small projects in several countries may have limited the achievement of higher-level results. However, there is some evidence of promising outcomes and important changes. For example, in Project SPA-1211, the implementation of quality management systems for the administration of elections at a national level has had regional impact. The OAS reported seeing a ripple effect across the region as electoral bodies in one country learned of the ISO electoral certification of their counterparts in another country, and then followed their example by requesting the General Secretariat’s assistance to implement a quality management system.

Moreover, at the organizational level, CIDA-2 encouraged the development of General Secretariat staff capacities for gender mainstreaming in all projects. However, at the project level, the integration of the gender perspective in CIDA-2 projects was mostly limited to the integration of sex-specific indicators and results, and there is little evidence of outcomes related to gender mainstreaming.

**Efficiency**

CIDA-2 had a comprehensive management structure that included a steering committee and a technical secretariat. However, the General Secretariat did not implement the governance structure in conformity with the Project Management Plan and Leadership of CIDA-2 varied throughout the grant period. Whereas, Senior Management exercised oversight during the first two years, leadership was mostly delegated to the General Secretariat Evaluation Unit in the third year.

Moreover, stakeholders interviewed confirmed that they were satisfied with the type of oversight provided by the Representatives of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS as most of the follow-up from the Canadian Government regarding CIDA-2 came from the Permanent Mission.

The implementation of CIDA-2 followed the terms of the Grant Arrangement with Canada, but multiple flaws in the design of projects, such as overly ambitious outcomes or lack of follow-up led to inefficiencies. In addition, CIDA-2 monitoring mechanisms did not always facilitate
data collection for activities and outputs. Data on outcomes was not collected after implementation as no mechanism was put in place to do so. The efficiency of CIDA-2 was also affected by some delays in project start-up and the cost of short-term contracts which represented approximately 42 per cent of the overall resources of the Cooperation Plan. The use of external consultants to implement CIDA-2 projects indicates that the General Secretariat used considerable CIDA-2 resources to augment its capacity at headquarters and to implement projects for which it did not have readily available technical capacities.

Finally, the evaluation showed CIDA-2’s financial reporting systems were sharper than CIDA-1’s and allowed project managers to know where resources went and to have real time access to budgetary information. However, there are still serious limitations in the General Secretariat’s financial systems. The financial department has to deal with over 500 different agreements with different donors and partners, each of whom has its own requirements. Currently, the General Secretariat lacks resources to improve its financial system and become a more efficient organization.

Sustainability

Follow-up was not specified as an integral part of delivery of outputs, thus the likelihood of sustainability is greater for projects that support OAS core functions. The sustainability of CIDA-2 project results appears to be minimal. Reasons for this include: a) project outputs, size and scope were not appropriate to lead to longer-term results; b) project design, which in many cases did not include follow-up; and c) project teams were not expected to leverage additional funds beyond resources provided by CIDA-2. Follow-up, in particular, was a major concern for CIDA-2 as it was not planned nor budgeted for.

In addition, the dependency on CIDA-2 funds in some General Secretariat departments allowed a number of these departments to grow in size and in scope, but no long-term planning was done to ensure that this growth would be sustainable. Based on interviews and documents reviewed, CIDA-2 projects had a higher degree of sustainability when they were in areas in which the General Secretariat had a long history of implementing projects and programs or when project teams interviewed were able to describe the next steps of the projects and what would happen one year from now. Activities related to elections management and monitoring had more likelihood of sustainability because the General Secretariat had significant in-house capability in those areas; many of these activities predated CIDA-2 and were not as dependent as most others on CIDA-2 financing.

Conclusion

Most countries in Latin America and the Caribbean region are now middle-income countries in which private sector development is an important vector of development. In this context, the second Cooperation Plan between the OAS and CIDA, which aimed to support electoral management bodies, enhance business environment and access to markets, strengthen gender equality and the OAS, was highly relevant. There was improvement over CIDA-1 noted in the evaluation of CIDA-2, including in the performance measurement framework and logic models, financial systems, and comprehensive management structure developed. However, there remained gaps in evidence and monitoring data, as well as sustainability and follow-up planning. In addition, given the multiple mandates of the OAS and the critical lack of funding of the Organization, CIDA-2 could have put greater emphasis on projects that complemented areas in which the General Secretariat had recognized in-house expertise and capacity.

Recommendations

Recommendations to Global Affairs Canada

1) Global Affairs Canada should ensure that any future Cooperation Plans between GAC and the OAS are better
anchored in areas where the General Secretariat has substantive knowledge and in-house capacity.

Recommendation to the Senior Management of the General Secretariat of the OAS

2) Senior management of the General Secretariat of the OAS should fully discharge its oversight roles and responsibilities in the management of cooperation plans such as CIDA-2.

Strategic Recommendations to the General Secretariat for future cooperation plans

3) In any future cooperation plan, the General Secretariat of the OAS should ensure that project selection, design and implementation are firmly anchored in specific approved OAS mandates and that they are principally in areas where the General Secretariat has in-house capacity and a good track record of technical work and cooperation.

4) In any future cooperation plan, the General Secretariat should ensure that the number of projects and their distribution across countries supports sustainable results and that there are a reasonable number of realistic and achievable outcomes commensurate with the resources available.

5) To increase relevance and sustainability of results, the General Secretariat should ensure that cooperation plan projects are more demand-driven.

Operational Recommendations to the General Secretariat

6) The General Secretariat should ensure that project teams plan better for capacity building activities and allocate resources for follow-up activities.

7) The General Secretariat should be more transparent in countries where it implements projects and share more information on its projects with national representatives.

8) The General Secretariat should ensure that gender integration is mainstreamed in all projects and cascade down projects and be obvious in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

9) Specific guidance and protocols for harmonization and/or standardization of OAS websites should be developed and implemented, and periodic reports on the usage of websites should be produced in order to determine if demand is sufficient to maintain and update them.

10) Since much of its work (and certainly donor-funded initiatives) is directed toward technical cooperation, the General Secretariat should continue to strengthen its use and commitment to results-based management by extending it to non-donor funded activities and projects. In implementing this recommendation, it might consider assessing its performance in the management of development cooperation as a means of identifying areas that should be strengthened and obtaining specific suggestions for strengthening RBM in those areas. Modernization and standardization of the General Secretariat’s financial systems – including those implemented for donor-funded activities – should be an integral component of this process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td>Asociación Empresarial para el Desarrollo (Costa Rica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENPROMYPE</td>
<td>Foundation to Promote the Competitiveness of Micro and Small Enterprise in Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIM</td>
<td>Inter-American Commission of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITES</td>
<td>Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSHN-SIAR</td>
<td>Consumer Safety and Health Network for the Americas – Inter-American Rapid Alert System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFATD</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAMS</td>
<td>Department of Financial and Administration Management Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPE</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMB</td>
<td>Electoral Management Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP</td>
<td>Inter-American Program on the Promotion of Women's Human Rights and Gender Equity and Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEAB</td>
<td>International Electoral Accreditation Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAI</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de Transparencia, Access a la Información y Protección de datos personales(Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INE</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional Electoral (Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Logic Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESECVI</td>
<td>Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESICIC</td>
<td>Mechanism for Follow-Up on the Implementation of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFDR</td>
<td>Managing for Development Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIIC</td>
<td>Ministry of Industry, Investment and Commerce (El Salvador)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSME</td>
<td>Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Organization of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMF</td>
<td>Performance Measurement Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results-Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAC</td>
<td>Red Interamericana de Competitividad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPPI</td>
<td>Reports on progress of project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small or Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORs</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1  Introduction

1.1  Background

In 2012, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the Organization of American States (OAS) entered into a second three-year Cooperation Plan, also known as CIDA-2, to address a variety of issues in the areas of socio-economic development, trade and elections administration in the Latin America and Caribbean region, as well as to strengthen corresponding areas in the General Secretariat of the OAS.

This report presents the Evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2012-2015. The evaluation was commissioned and managed by the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE) of the OAS General Secretariat. It was conducted by Universalia Management Group Ltd, an external independent evaluation team, between October 2015 and May 2016.

The primary audiences for the evaluation are the OAS General Secretariat, DPE and senior management, and the Canadian government.

1.2  Evaluation Objectives

As per the Terms of Reference (TORs) included in Appendix I, the evaluation had the following objectives:

- To evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2012 -2015
- To assess the delivery of the main outputs, and the immediate and intermediate outcomes of all projects
- To assess contributions to the ultimate outcome of the Cooperation Plan as outlined in the Logic Model and the Performance Measurement Framework approved by CIDA and the General Secretariat of the OAS.

1.3  Methodology

This section provides an overview of the methodology used for the evaluation. It describes the evaluation framework (see Appendix II), methods and sources of data, as well as the evaluation challenges and mitigating strategies. The evaluation was based on the main evaluation criteria in the TORs (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability).
Evaluation Process

The evaluation included four phases:

- **Inception (October – November 2015):** Consultations between the evaluation team and the General Secretariat, stakeholder mapping, meetings in Washington with key stakeholders, finalization of selection criteria for country visits, finalization of methodology, and submission of draft inception report.

- **Data collection (December 2015 – March 2016):** In-depth review of CIDA-2 documents; portfolio review of 20 projects; seven country visits; telephone/Skype interviews with additional respondents from the Government of Canada.

- **Data analysis (April 2016):** Analysis and interpretation of data, briefing on preliminary findings.

- **Reporting (April – May 2016):** Submission of draft and final reports and presentation to the General Secretariat and the Canadian Permanent Mission.

Data Collection Methods

The evaluation team used the following methods to collect data for the evaluation:

**Interviews:** The evaluation team consulted 146 stakeholders (in Washington, DC and at country level). All individual and group interviews followed agreed-upon interview protocols tailored to categories of stakeholders and aligned with the overall evaluation framework. Interviews were semi-structured but flexible, allowing new questions to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewee discussed. Please see Appendix III for a list of stakeholders consulted and Appendix IV for sample interview protocols.

**Document review:** During the inception phase, the evaluation team reviewed key documents as they were made available. During the data collection phase, the team carried out an in-depth review of documents to generate information to address the key evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the evaluation matrix. These included, amongst others, previous evaluations of the Cooperation Plan, the grant arrangement, OAS corporate documents, and other relevant articles and websites. Please see Appendix V for the list of documents consulted.

**Project portfolio review:** The purpose of the portfolio review was to provide a broad overview of all 20 projects included in the Cooperation Plan. Documents reviewed for the portfolio review included, among others: project profiles, project financial documentation (budget), reports on progress of project implementation (RPPI), project status reports for decision makers, and project verification reports. The evaluation team developed a portfolio review tool to collect systematic data on individual projects, including quantitative and qualitative information and examples.

**Country visits:** Eight countries were selected for field missions to collect in-depth data: Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, and Peru. El Salvador was not visited for security reasons, but the evaluation team carried out virtual consultations by telephone and Skype. The strategy for the selection of countries aimed to ensure regional coverage, opportunities to examine multiple projects, and a critical mass of beneficiaries and other respondents. The country visits ensured that information came from a wide and representative mix of stakeholders who provided different perspectives based on their roles and responsibilities in the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan. During the country visits, which were conducted over two to three days in each country, the evaluation
team conducted semi-structured interviews or group interviews with staff in Offices of the General Secretariat in Member States, beneficiaries and partners of the OAS, as well as with representatives of national agencies in charge of supervising and/or coordinating international technical cooperation.

**Validation of preliminary findings:** The evaluation team shared preliminary findings with the DPE in April 2016 with a view to identifying factual errors, addressing information gaps and obtaining feedback on preliminary findings and conclusions. Feedback from the DPE was used to inform this report.

**Data Analysis**

The evaluation team used a combination of data analysis methods (descriptive analysis, content analysis, and quantitative/statistical analysis). This mixed methods approach allowed for triangulation and ensured that findings were supported by a range of sources and types of data (subjective, objective, quantitative). For the portfolio review, the evaluation team used Excel to build a review tool that used both qualitative and quantitative data coding and filtering.

**Evaluation Limitations and Mitigating Strategies**

The evaluation encountered some challenges and employed strategies to mitigate or limit their effects, as described below.

- All respondents consulted were identified by the General Secretariat. Some project teams identified more respondents than others and the evaluation team received significantly more information on those projects. As a result, they are more preeminent throughout this report. The evaluation team chose to interview respondents who might be more knowledgeable about CIDA-2 projects and tried to balance the information gathered from stakeholders with documents reviewed on each project. Many projects included seminars or training events as their primary activities, and we tried to interview both attendees and officials of the attendees’ organizations in order to get a better handle on possible benefits.

- Many respondents in countries could not distinguish CIDA-2 projects from other general OAS projects. In many cases, they referred in general to cooperation with the OAS, and their impressions on the effectiveness and efficiency of work with OAS teams. To the extent possible, the evaluation team probed for respondents’ views on specific CIDA-2 activities, but there was still some degree of confusion regarding the source of financing.

- This evaluation was asked to examine the outcomes of CIDA-2. However, there is little or no monitoring data available on CIDA-2 outcomes, even immediate outcomes. Given CIDA-2’s short time frame of three years, it is also unlikely that outcomes would be measurable or observable by the end of the Cooperation Plan. Finally, very little data had been collected by the General Secretariat on progress towards the achievement of intermediate or ultimate outcomes. In the absence of hard data, limited anecdotal evidence is presented.
1.4 Report Overview

Following this introduction, the report is organized as follows:

- Chapter 2 presents information on the background and context of CIDA-2
- Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 review the overall performance of CIDA-2 in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability
- Chapter 7 presents the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.
2 Background and Context

2.1 Overview

This chapter provides a profile of the OAS, the context in Latin America and the Caribbean, Canadian government programming in the Americas, and a profile of the 2012-2015 OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan, including its history, objectives and priorities, activities, governance and management systems.

2.2 OAS profile

The Organization of American States brings together all 35 independent states of the Americas. It constitutes the main political, juridical, and social governmental forum in the region. The OAS provides services to Member States using a four-pronged approach based on democracy, human rights, security, and development. The overall mandate of the OAS as stipulated in Article 1 of the Charter is to achieve among its member states “an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence.”

In addition to being a political organization, the General Secretariat of the OAS conducts development work through various initiatives and programs, generally to implement a large number of mandates that have been approved at formal meetings by the Member States, most without specific funding for implementation. Donors such as Canada, Spain and the United States have contributed to extra budgetary financing for OAS development efforts. As of 2014, the OAS had over 750 individual mandates approved by its Member States. These mandates range widely, from topics such as “Youth in the Americas” to “Modernization and use of electoral technologies in the Hemisphere.” The OAS does not have sufficient financial resources to address all its mandates, primarily due to non-payment of dues by a few Member States, and there are deep and long-standing concerns about the financial health of the Organization and its capacity to serve the interests of the Member States.

2.3 Context in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)

LAC is composed of a very heterogeneous group of countries in which sustaining growth and reducing poverty are complex undertakings. Most countries are middle-income countries, but the region also includes small island states and one fragile state (Haiti).

During the 2000s, the region experienced impressive economic growth and extreme poverty was reduced from an estimated 25 per cent to 12 per cent of the population. “Overall, a remarkable 70

---

2 The large and increasing number of “unfunded mandates” of the OAS has been discussed for many years.

 million people moved out of poverty: the strongest poverty reduction performance of the region in decades." These changes led to growth of the middle class. Thanks to growing fiscal space, social programs were put together to help support the poor and disadvantaged. In spite of these advances, over 225 million people still live in poverty in the Americas, and inequalities are found not only in income distribution and access to economic opportunities, but also in access to social services and political voice.

Over the past five years, however, the region has faced a continuing decline in growth, in part due to an adverse external environment. Important economies such as Brazil and Venezuela have slowed considerably, and a recent report by two UN agencies projected that “the evolution of labor markets in Latin America and the Caribbean during 2016 will generally be negative, due to forecasts for a more deteriorated macroeconomic context and growth levels than last year.” According to the 2015 Latinobarómetro public opinion survey, the main issues in the region are unemployment and violence (public safety).

Democracy is the most common type of government in the region, but with high degrees of variance. In many LAC countries, democracy remains fragile and the lack of government transparency and accountability, weak institutions, and corruption continue to undermine democratic progress. In 2015, less than 40 per cent of citizens of Latin America and the Caribbean were satisfied with the democratic performance of their countries. In terms of human rights, frequent violations linked organized crime and violations against migrants and indigenous people have been noted and reported in many countries. Women are still marginalized in certain areas and have less access to economic and political opportunities in the Americas. Violence against women remains a challenge throughout the region.

2.4 Canadian Government Programming in the Americas

Since the signature of the CIDA-2 Grant Arrangement in 2012, the Government of Canada has gone through several changes. In 2013, CIDA was amalgamated with the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD). In October 2015, a new government was elected and DFATD was renamed Global Affairs Canada. The priorities of DFATD/Global Affairs Canada are as follows:

1) Advance Canada’s values and interests through leadership and constructive engagement on key global issues with strategic partners, including at the UN and other multilateral institutions such as La Francophonie.

2) Contribute to inclusive Canadian and global prosperity with an emphasis on expanding and deepening trade and investment relationships with large, fast-growing markets, such as China and India, and traditional partners.

---

7 Ibid.
3) Reinforce Canada’s relations with the United States and key bilateral partners to advance Canadian interests.

4) Strengthen Canada’s contribution to reducing poverty and inequality, supporting fragile states, building resilience and responding to humanitarian needs.

The amalgamation of CIDA with the Department was ongoing throughout the implementation of CIDA-2 and impacted CIDA-2 and its management. For a long period, the General Secretariat did not have a counterpart in Ottawa in relation to the Cooperation Plan, and institutional memory regarding CIDA-2 was lost.

During CIDA-2, Canada’s Strategy for Engagement in the Americas identified the OAS as an important multilateral partner for advancing Canada’s goals of: increasing mutual economic opportunities; strengthening security and advancing freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law; and fostering lasting relationships.

In 2012-2013, Canada directed 13 per cent of its international assistance (or CAD 714 million) to the LAC region. Haiti, which was not part of CIDA-2, was among the largest recipients with almost CAD 125 million.

### 2.5 Background on the Cooperation Plan

During the sixth Summit of the Americas in Colombia in April 2012, Former Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced Canada’s commitment to economic growth and development in the Americas. This pledge led to the development of the Cooperation Plan for 2012 to 2015 and CIDA provided a grant of CAD 19.5 million to the General Secretariat of the OAS. This was the second Cooperation Plan between the two organizations and built on the first Cooperation Plan (CIDA-1) which was implemented from 2008 to 2011.

CIDA-2 had a regional and country-focused approach and was implemented in a selection of Latin American and Caribbean countries addressing specific sector gaps. In March 2015, a four-month grant extension was requested and approved by Canada. CIDA-2 activities were completed on 31 August 2015. CIDA-2 financial contributions represented roughly 4 per cent of the total OAS budget from 2012-2015 (as of August 2015).

Six OAS Secretariats benefitted from CIDA-2: Integral Development, Political Affairs, Legal Affairs, Administrative and Financial Affairs, Office of the Secretary General, and Summit Secretariat. Approximately 40 OAS staff members worked on its implementation to carry out 20 projects in the five areas of intervention outlined in the table below. (See Appendix VI for a list of CIDA-2 projects.)

---


Table 2.1  CIDA-2 Intervention Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION AREAS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>% OF CIDA-2 BUDGET(^\text{10})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy by Supporting Electoral Management Bodies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment by Enhancing Policies and Regulatory Frameworks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Markets by Promoting Regional Trade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality by Strengthening Application of Human Rights Instruments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Strengthening and Improving Performance of the OAS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIDA-2 was formulated and monitored based on a Logic Model and a Performance Measurement Framework (PMF). Gender considerations were integrated in both of these instruments. To monitor progress of the Cooperation Plan, indicators were developed and data was collected on a year-to-year basis. CIDA-2 had 148 indicators applied to 60 results statements. The General Secretariat went through an internal process to select relevant CIDA-2 projects. From 120 project proposals, 37 were selected and represented the 37 outputs of the PMF. In many instances, CIDA-2 funding was used to fulfill unbudgeted OAS mandates, e.g., work with civil society organizations (project SER-1201), gender (projects CIM-1202 and CIM-1203), and a Hemispheric Summit (project SUM-1201).

The PMF was considered relatively weak in terms of specification (including indicators) and eventual measurement of outcomes, which were given at three levels: “immediate,” “intermediate,” and “final.” In 2014, the General Secretariat took corrective actions to improve the PMF and increase the likelihood that expected results could be measured. In a short-term program such as CIDA-2, it is very difficult to achieve and measure outcomes during implementation.

Each year, projects received 70 per cent of funding at the beginning of the year, and the remaining 30 per cent upon the satisfactory completion of a project progress report validated by the DPE. The annual disbursements of CIDA-2 were well balanced throughout the three years of implementation.

Figure 2.1  Distribution of CIDA-2 Funding, by Year

\(^{10}\) The remaining 12% went to Indirect Cost Recovery (11%) and Program Evaluation (1%).
Main differences between CIDA-1 and CIDA-2

The most salient differences between CIDA-1 and CIDA-2 were in the program emphasis. CIDA-2 placed more emphasis on improving “Business Environment” and “Access to Markets” and less on “Promotion of Policy Dialogue and Summit/Ministerial Follow-Up”.

CIDA-2 improved planning and monitoring at the activity and output level, principally as a result of lessons learned from CIDA-1 (which did not have a comprehensive performance measurement framework) and the consequent changes in the General Secretariat’s planning and monitoring culture. CIDA-2 also introduced project profiles to describe the intent behind the projects.

2.6 Governance and Management of the Cooperation Plan

The CIDA-2 Project Management Plan included a complete organizational structure designed to govern and manage the Cooperation Plan. The main components of the structure are shown in the figure below.

Figure 2.2 CIDA-2 Governance and Management Structure
A Joint Steering Committee was to provide leadership and advice regarding the orientation and implementation of CIDA-2. It was to meet once a year and was to include high level stakeholders and/or experts from both CIDA and the OAS General Secretariat. The Steering Committee was charged with providing guidance on key issues such as objectives, budgetary control, and decisions involving the program. Its responsibilities and composition are shown in the sidebar.

An internal Executive Committee was the highest internal authority for the Cooperation Plan. The main duties of the Executive Committee were to act as a political counterpart to CIDA, and to provide overall guidance and supervision for program execution.

The Technical Secretariat, composed of two persons, was charged with operational planning, coordination, monitoring, follow-up and coaching.

Five core teams, divided by “intermediate outcomes,” were in charge of the delivery of outputs.

CIDA-2 also received the support of General Secretariat units such as the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE), the Department of Financial and Administration Management Services (DFAMS), and the Inter-American Commission of Women (CIM).

### Responsibilities of Joint Steering Committee

Review the overall management and implementation of the OAS Cooperation Plan

Recommend to CIDA for approval, any necessary actions to address delays and/challenges towards the achievement of expected results

Review the gender strategy specific to the OAS Cooperation Plan and its implementation; recommend to CIDA for approval, any necessary actions to address delays and/or challenges

Review and recommend to CIDA for approval the annual cost of the work plans

Review and recommend to CIDA for approval the annual and final narrative and financial reports

Recommend to CIDA for approval possible reprogramming of activities

Review the Terms of Reference of the “end-of-project” evaluation

Review project assessments, monitoring, evaluation reports and recommendations regarding possible corrective measures

Review communication strategy initiatives and support their implementation.

### Composition of the Joint Steering Committee

**CIDA:** Two to three representatives, depending on subject matter, including director, and/or program manager, and/or senior development officer, and/or technical advisor

**OAS:** Two to three representatives, depending on the subject matter, including Head of the internal Steering Committee, and/or Member of the Internal Steering Committee, Technical Secretary, Core Team Manager(s)
3 Relevance of CIDA-2

Relevance: The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. (OECD-DAC Definition)

**Key message:** The evaluation of CIDA-1 highlighted the relevance of the Cooperation Plan in countries and in addressing priorities of CIDA and of the General Secretariat. CIDA-2 showed similar high degrees of relevance at the country level. CIDA-2 was well aligned with national development plans and responded to needs in countries, although projects were often supply-driven.\(^ {11}\) For Canada, the Cooperation Plan was relevant and directly linked to each of the three priorities of the government of Canada in Latin America and the Caribbean. While most CIDA-2 projects were aligned with OAS mandates, many were not in areas in which the OAS has a high degree of technical capacities, which would have increased synergy and efficiency given the limited resources available.

**Finding 1:** All consulted stakeholders considered CIDA-2 activities highly relevant to their organizations; the document review found that projects were well-aligned with the national development plans of OAS Member States. However, it is not clear whether the countries selected to receive services from each project were those with the greatest need for those services.

The evaluation found that CIDA-2 projects were highly relevant to country stakeholders and congruent with national development plans and strategies. Work priorities are given to the General Secretariat in the form of mandates approved in formal OAS meetings, which also reflect Member States’ needs. All stakeholders consulted in the countries visited mentioned that projects were very relevant to them and their organizations. Some stakeholders added that they had wanted to undertake these projects, but could not have done it without OAS resources.

The table below summarizes the national development priorities of the eight countries sampled in

---

Costa Rica: Stakeholders considered CIDA-2 projects highly relevant; especially in terms of the roadmap the country is following to become a member of the OECD. Many CIDA-2 projects are directly linked to these efforts.

Paraguay: CIDA-2 projects were also very relevant for Paraguay. According to documents reviewed, the public sector is the largest employer by far, but is inefficient, corrupt, and lacks competence at all levels. In addition to the technical cooperation CIDA-2 provided to MESISIC, constitutes an essential support for the important anti-corruption efforts undertaken in Paraguay.

---

\(^ {11}\) In the countries visited, officials of government entities whose functions include the coordination of international technical cooperation were not aware of the 20 CIDA-2 projects and were unable to describe a demand-driven process for determining which countries would participate in a given project. In other words, Member States were not asked to prioritize the projects in which they wished to be included. Similarly, the OAS Offices in the Member States did not have this information.
the evaluation. It shows that there was high relevance in the areas of “business environment” and “access to markets” which all countries had established as national priorities. Democracy was cited less often in national development plans, but OAS electoral technical cooperation projects are initiated following a formal request from an OAS Member State, which confirms the need to strengthen electoral processes in certain countries. Full details on each country’s development priorities are shown in Appendix VII.

**Project SPA-1211: “Foros de la democracia” in Mexico**

OAS Member States can grow and modernize institutionally, but addressing issues related to democracy, while extremely relevant, remains a challenge since it is a very heterogeneous group of countries. Nonetheless, there are many possibilities for the exchange of experiences, i.e., South-South cooperation.

Mexico has strong electoral management bodies, but still lacks civic education for citizens to become more involved in governance. This type of education will require long-term work. The work carried out in collaboration with the OAS, e.g., *Foros de la democracia latinoamericana*, is very relevant to advance public debate and knowledge about democracy and elections. It allows for the creation of spaces for reflection on citizenship, human rights, etc.

**Table 3.1 Linkages between CIDA-2’s Areas of Intervention and National Development Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY VISITED</th>
<th>DEMOCRACY</th>
<th>BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>ACCESS TO MARKETS</th>
<th>GENDER EQUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru19</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Country and beneficiary selection

Although the relevance of projects was high, as confirmed by stakeholders and documents reviewed, the criteria used to select participating countries and beneficiaries were inconsistent or unclear. Neither the Member States nor the OAS Offices in the Member States were apprised of the 20 projects to be financed under CIDA-2, nor were they asked to select those they felt best responded to their priorities. The countries included in each project were selected by each of the implementing departments at the General Secretariat’s headquarters.

Country selection: The document review did not find consistent criteria in 15 project documents that indicated how the General Secretariat selected Member States for CIDA-2 projects, nor evidence of a demand-driven process by the countries themselves. Based on the projects that provided information on how countries were selected for CIDA-2, it seems that selection methods varied considerably, as shown in the examples below.

- **Project SID-1212 in Jamaica on Corporate Social Responsibility**: Officials in the country missions to the OAS in Washington, DC were the CIDA-2 project team’s primary points of contact for the identification of beneficiary countries. The SID-1212 project team presented the OAS Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) workshop to the Washington representatives, who liaised with their respective foreign ministries. The General Secretariat selected all the countries that showed interest in the project’s CSR training opportunities.

- **Project CIM-1202 on enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belém do Pará Convention**: For some time, the CIM had received suggestions or requests from Member States to better structure the data collection process for the Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI) and from civil society organizations, to provide a view of the implementation of the Convention that went beyond a list of activities undertaken by governments. Countries were selected for the CIM-1202 project according to several criteria: i) willingness to participate in the project and agreement with its objectives/activities; ii) countries that were at the beginning of an election cycle (countries with upcoming elections tend to change their personnel, even at the technical level, so there was little point in investing in training in those countries); and iii) prior active involvement in the MESECVI process.

- **Project SID-1207 on capacity building for use of natural resources**: A Needs Assessment Survey for Judicial Capacity Building was conducted by the project team. Some countries, e.g., Colombia, expressed a clear need for a workshop.

Beneficiary selection: Interviewed stakeholders mentioned that some project teams did not identify beneficiaries at the onset and were always in the process of identifying them. The document review confirmed that criteria for the identification of in-country beneficiaries were difficult to observe. For example, project SID-1212 states that the identification of participants for CSR training was typically done by the government or local CSR organizations. In two countries visited (Jamaica and Costa Rica), stakeholders had reservations about the demand for CSR training by micro, small, and medium-size enterprises (MSMEs). Consulted stakeholders said that this demand clearly does not come from micro or small enterprises, as they do not have sufficient knowledge and resources to apply the CSR concept.

---

Stakeholders also noted the lack of incentives in countries to apply these principles, and indicated that there is little or no legislation to encourage the use of CSR.

**Finding 2:** There is strong alignment between CIDA-2 and the Government of Canada’s Strategy for Engagement in the Americas, which places high importance on economic prosperity, democracy and fostering lasting relationships.

The document review found strong alignment between CIDA-2 projects and Canadian priorities in 19 of the 20 projects of the Cooperation Plan. Stakeholders also noted the alignment of CIDA-2 with Canada’s Strategy for Engagement in the Americas, which has led to the investment of more than CAD 5.4 billion in international assistance in Latin America and the Caribbean since 2007. For example, project SPA-1211 on Strengthening Electoral Management Bodies (EMB) was closely related to Canada’s Goal 3. This project constitutes the only forum that congregates all of the electoral authorities of the hemisphere (both administrative bodies and judicial bodies) and that promotes horizontal cooperation among the EMBs in order to strengthen their institutional capacity.

As described in Chapter 2, the whole-of-government approach has three main goals, as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANADIAN PRIORITIES</th>
<th>CIDA-2 FIELDS OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE % OF CIDA-2 FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Increasing Canadian and hemispheric economic opportunity</td>
<td>“Access to markets” “Business environment”</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Addressing insecurity and advancing freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law</td>
<td>“Democracy” “Gender equality”</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Fostering lasting relationships</td>
<td>Several components of individual projects included a regional focus, for instance: conferences in the Caribbean, workshops in Central America, and opportunities to network and create relationships across the region.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Remaining 12% went to evaluation (1%), Indirect Cost Recovery (11%).
Finding 3: All CIDA-2 projects supported the overall mandates of the OAS. However, given the multiple OAS unfunded mandates and its limited financial and human resources, CIDA-2 projects tend to have more relevance in areas where the OAS is recognized as a major player, where it has expertise (niche) and technical capacity (e.g., promoting democracy and defending human rights).

The document review found that all CIDA-2 projects had a justification and rationale clearly linked to an OAS mandate. However, the mandates of the OAS are very broad and diverse and its Charter includes a number of priorities or “essential purposes” (see sidebar).

OAS mandates come from resolutions approved by Member States and most do not have funding attached to them. Funding from CIDA-2 was a way to address some mandates that are not, or only partly, funded.

On the basis of the information collected in the countries visited, it would seem that projects that are considered most relevant, which in turn should lead to increased effectiveness and sustainability, are those in areas where the General Secretariat has recognized in-house technical expertise, such as monitoring of elections or work on human rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAS Essential Purposes from Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To strengthen the peace and security of the continent;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To promote and consolidate representative democracy, with due respect for the principle of nonintervention;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To prevent possible causes of difficulties and to ensure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the Member States;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) To provide for common action on the part of those States in the event of aggression;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) To seek the solution of political, juridical, and economic problems that may arise among them;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) To promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) To eradicate extreme poverty, which constitutes an obstacle to the full democratic development of the peoples of the hemisphere; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) To achieve an effective limitation of conventional weapons that will make it possible to devote the largest amount of resources to the economic and social development of the Member States.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Effectiveness of CIDA-2

4.1 Overview

Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives. (OECD-DAC Definition)

Key message: The evaluation of CIDA-1 criticized the Cooperation Plan for the absence of an overarching results framework or performance measurement framework and for the output-oriented nature of the projects. CIDA-2 developed a comprehensive performance measurement framework and improved the RBM skills of the General Secretariat staff involved in CIDA-2 projects. However, additional training, incentives and senior management support will be required to continue progress on RBM throughout the General Secretariat. As was the case in CIDA-1, the evidence of outcome achievement in CIDA-2 remained anecdotal due to lack of data and the difficulty of achieving ambitious outcomes with limited resources within a short timeframe. The limited and localized results reported thus far suggest that funding many small interventions in many countries may have limited CIDA-2’s effectiveness and sustainability.

4.2 Output Level

Finding 4: Most CIDA-2 projects were successful in carrying out planned activities and producing expected outputs; overall, CIDA-2 delivered approximately 73 per cent of its outputs. However, follow-up activities that are necessary in order to achieve planned outcomes, were generally, not included nor financed in project design.

CIDA-2 delivered 27 of its 37 planned outputs (73%). The outputs were classified as follows:

- Capacity building (training/technical support) for OAS partners and beneficiaries: 15 outputs planned; 11 achieved
- OAS strengthening: 7 outputs planned; 4 achieved
- Knowledge exchange/awareness raising: 6 outputs planned; 5 achieved
- Creation of network or community of practice: 5 outputs planned; 4 achieved
- Monitoring: 4 outputs planned; 3 achieved.

Outputs related to OAS strengthening had the lowest level of achievement (four out of seven outputs), while outputs in the areas of network/community of practice and knowledge exchange had the highest proportion of achievement, as shown in the table below:
Table 4.1  Achievement of Outputs by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF OUTPUTS</th>
<th>% ACHIEVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building for OAS partners and beneficiaries (15 outputs)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS strengthening (7 outputs)</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge exchange/awareness raising (6 outputs)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of network or community of practice (5 outputs)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring (4 outputs)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The General Secretariat does not collect data on the achievement of outputs by country, as outputs are not planned per country. It was therefore impossible to crosscheck these numbers with country-level data.

As noted in the table above, over 40 per cent of CIDA-2 outputs were capacity building interventions (e.g., workshops or training sessions). All stakeholders consulted in countries provided positive feedback on the overall quality of these sessions, the facilitators, and the materials. A few people consulted felt that the content of country workshops was sometimes too generic rather than adapted to the countries in which they were held.

Finally, it should be noted that follow-up activities must be included in the design of outputs – all that is necessary – in order to increase the likelihood that planned outcomes will be achieved.

Examples of successful outputs include:

Project SPA-1211: International Electoral Accreditation Body (IEAB): CIDA-2 funding provided the basis for the creation of the IEAB and Korea, Turkey and Mexico jointly contributed US$ 220,000 to further develop the accreditation body. The IEAB has been fully operational since 2015 and so far has organized three workshops to train and certify participants as lead electoral assessors. In addition, it has accredited two certification organisms that can now carry out assessments and certify electoral management bodies. As a result, in the Dominican Republic, the Junta Central Electoral for Santo Domingo was certified in August 2015 and the Oficina Nacional de Procesos Electorales of Peru initiated the certification process in December 2015.

Project SAJ-1203: Technical support for Secured Transaction Reform in El Salvador: The Ministry of Industry, Investment and Commerce (MIIC) began drafting a bill in 2010 on secured transactions. In 2013, the Government adopted a law based entirely on the OAS Model Inter-American Law on Secured Transactions. This law later facilitated the creation of the corresponding registry (Registro de Garantías Mobiliarias). The law allows the use of non-conventional collateral items for loans such as crops and intellectual property. According to stakeholders interviewed, the Secured Transaction Law now facilitates access to credit for micro and small businesses, and ultimately allows them to play a bigger part in the economic development of the country. In addition, stakeholders confirmed that the Law and the Registro are used very frequently by the targeted businesses.

Project SID-1207: Capacity Building Program of Country Officials for the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources: The General Secretariat developed a set of tools and methodologies to support states parties...
to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) to evaluate potential positive and negative economic and social impacts of the Convention in countries.

However, sustainability of this result is unclear as no follow-up mechanism is in place to ensure that countries are using the tools to conduct these assessments. In Peru, country officials plan to conduct one assessment in 2016 using the new tools, but there is no technical support available to Member States to ensure that the assessment tools are being used adequately.

**Examples of less successful outputs:**

**Project CIM-1202 in Dominican Republic: Enhancing the capacity of Member States to implement the Belém do Pará Convention.** The persons interviewed at the *Ministerio de la Mujer* who had attended a workshop on indicators held in Santo Domingo and financed at least partially by CIDA-2 made reference to a list of 92 indicators they had prepared. However, they had not begun the work of selecting which ones to use, or which to adapt to the specific characteristics of the Dominican Republic and to data availabilities or developing data sources.

### 4.3 Immediate Outcomes

**Finding 5:** While there is little documented evidence of “immediate” outcomes, consulted stakeholders noted that CIDA-2 activities contributed to new knowledge among training participants, raising awareness on some issues, and building networks. Factors that enhanced outcome achievement included work with long-term OAS partners and work in areas where the Secretariat had previous experience.

Immediate or initial outcomes are usually observed during or shortly after the implementation period, and they are often difficult to identify. Stakeholder consultations in countries reveal that some CIDA-2 project activities had immediate effects following their implementation. However, there is little documented evidence that immediate planned outcomes were fully achieved, as shown in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2** Achievement of Immediate Outcomes by Field of Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>FINAL STATUS OF OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>Strengthened abilities of Electoral Bodies</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business environment</td>
<td>Strengthened ability of member states to design and adopt public policies, legislation and regulatory frameworks, in the areas of inclusive sustainable economic growth, competitiveness, innovation and MSMEs</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased awareness of the importance of responsible business practices among key stakeholders</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased capacity of ministries/ executing agencies and legislative committees to promote sound management practices</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD OF INTERVENTION</td>
<td>IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES</td>
<td>FINAL STATUS OF OUTCOMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved capacity of member states to implement secured transactions reform</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved capacity of member states to increase transparency and equitable access to public information</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to markets</td>
<td>Increased access by MSMEs to national institutions that provide services to increase regional/ sub-regional competitiveness</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened capacity of government officials for negotiation and implementation of trade agreements</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased knowledge by SMEs, working mainly in the extractive sector, of CSR</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased knowledge by commercial judges and other public officials to enforce international commercial dispute settlement and arbitration decisions related to trade</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality instruments</td>
<td>Improved capacity of member states to identify and analyze women’s rights and gender equality concerns and integrate them in public policies</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced capacity of member states to implement Belem Do Para and CEDAW</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Strengthening</td>
<td>Strengthened performance management capacity of the OAS, through RBM and the integration of gender equality in programs and projects</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened systems within the OAS to integrate, monitor and evaluate gender equality</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened OAS capacity to effectively respond to emerging priorities</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes in the region with a focus on equal participation</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved consultation with stakeholders regarding OAS programs, activities and policy making processes</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that 40 per cent of outputs were related to workshops or training events, the immediate effect reported most often by stakeholders during country visits related to new knowledge and ability to use the information gained during CIDA-2 sponsored training events. Stakeholders interviewed also perceived training events organized by the General Secretariat as important venues for awareness raising and for building personal and more informal networks with participants from other countries.

Other key results reported by stakeholders included the establishment of informal networks and the consolidation of formal networks such as the Red Interamericana de Competitividad (RIAC) created in
2009 which has increased its capacity to respond to and provide support to initiatives related to SME competitiveness thanks to CIDA-2 and other funders. The work of the General Secretariat has also promoted dialogue among government partners on certain topics, including discussions on draft laws (e.g., draft law on access to information) that were improved considerably thanks to OAS input.

A number of factors seem to have positively influenced the achievement of immediate outcomes:

- CIDA-2 projects’ work with long-term OAS partners such as INE or IFAI in Mexico has reportedly led to better follow-up by the OAS after output completion, which may be beneficial for the achievement of immediate and intermediate outcomes.

- CIDA-2 projects were more effective in areas in which the General Secretariat had previous experience and could tap into earlier work. When projects had little to build on, effectiveness and sustainability were less clear.

- In the El Salvador SPA-1208 project, the OAS had a quasi-permanent presence in the field through a regional consultant who was hired to provide training and seminars and to disseminate tools on process management to various public institutions. Stakeholders interviewed perceived his presence as a key facilitating factor.

- Interviews also indicated that the effectiveness of projects was largely dependent on the General Secretariat’s capacity to take advantage of political will of local governments to advance specific topics (e.g., registro mobiliario in El Salvador and Access to Public Information in Costa Rica). See sidebar.

Examples of effects reported by stakeholders: Project SPA-1215 – Cooperation Mechanism for Public Management

In the Dominican Republic (2014), where the Round of Analysis focused on the Public Services Management Model, the Ministry of Public Administration started to implement the recommendations raised in the Round of Analysis.

In Peru (2015), the findings and recommendations of the MECIGEP Report were considered and used to improve the structure of its Open-Data National Strategy which was issued by the Peruvian government in July 2015 as part of the framework of the National Policy on Modernization of the Public Management.

CIDA-2 contributions to national legal frameworks

CIDA-2 directly contributed to advances in the legal frameworks of several Latin American countries:

- In El Salvador, Project SAJ-1203 on secured transaction reform directly contributed to the establishment of a new law on secure transactions to increase access to credit for small and medium enterprises, based on the OAS model law.

- In Peru, a workshop on secured transactions contributed to identifying gaps in the current legal framework and to the development of a legal proposal for its reform, which is currently pending Congress approval.

- In Panama, Project SID-1212 contributed to a resolution on Corporate Social Responsibility and to a MoU between the National Assembly and civil society. This is seen as an important achievement in a country that had no legal framework on corporate social responsibility.

- In Mexico, the data collected for project CIM-1202, the Belém do Pará Convention, reportedly is being used as an evidence base for policies and preventive actions.

Project SAJ-1201 – Access to Public Information in Costa Rica

Although an Access to Public Information Law has still not been approved in Costa Rica, dialogue on this issue has increased over the past two years and the law has become a well-known topic. Costa Rica started working on a draft bill on access to public information around 2012, albeit at a very slow pace. OAS support in developing the bill based on the OAS model law has helped move the bill forward.

Stakeholders noted that there were major political factors involved in this project, which have led to the delayed consideration of this law.
The capacity of the OAS to convene high-level authorities and international organizations was also perceived by stakeholders as a positive factor enabling engagement from experts and governments.

Factors that constrained the achievement of results included the following:

- Workshops or training events tended to benefit *individuals* who participated rather than their organizations in the different Member States. This factor, along with the reported lack of follow-up, compromised the effectiveness and sustainability of training activities.
- The scope of projects also had a bearing on immediate outcomes. It is difficult to establish direct cause-and-effect relationships between regional outputs and specific country outcomes. It is also difficult to generate regional effects with small projects and little or no follow-up once activities are completed.

Together with over-reliance on regional or even national training workshops to encourage change, the lack of any meaningful follow-up appears to be the main factor that compromised the effectiveness (and sustainability) of CIDA-2 projects. The evaluation team noted that effectiveness (or outcomes) are non-existent or hard to track because of the obvious lack of follow-up. There was no evidence of consistent follow-up mechanisms used by the General Secretariat to assess and support the actual knowledge and understanding of the issues, and how this new knowledge was applied by participants in the workplace. For instance, project SID-1212 in Jamaica on Corporate Social Responsibility provided a training of trainers. While 19 of the 20 participants received trainer certification, they have not yet used their new skills to train other people or MSMEs, and there is no plan to do so in the near future due to lack of demand; however, the knowledge they acquired from the training is sometimes incorporated in advice they give to clients. The project expected to obtain MSME buy-in for CSR, but this may be unrealistic unless the notion of CSR is already accepted and implemented by larger firms in a given country.

**Finding 6:** At the organizational level, CIDA-2 encouraged the development of General Secretariat staff capacities for gender mainstreaming in all projects. At the project level, the integration of the gender perspective in CIDA-2 projects was mostly limited to design (e.g., gender-sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data); there is little evidence of outcomes related to gender mainstreaming.

The OAS has been working on gender mainstreaming for over 10 years with the support of the governments of various Member States, permanent observers and other donors. While there is general awareness of the importance of gender equality and women’s rights throughout the Organization, there is still confusion over the purpose of gender mainstreaming, how it should be done and who is responsible for coordinating it.\(^{21}\) As the entity charged with the implementation and follow up of the Inter-American Program on the Promotion of Women's Human Rights and Gender Equity and Equality (IAP), the Inter-American Commission of Women (CIM) has led organizational gender mainstreaming efforts in close collaboration with the DPE. These efforts have been made with few human and financial resources, and little capacity to provide follow-up or evaluation. In April 2014, it was reported that 68 per cent of all OAS programs and projects incorporated some level of gender perspective in their design. In September 2015, that percentage increased to 73 per cent of all approved projects.\(^{22}\)

---

\(^{21}\) OAS Cooperation Project Management Plan 2012-2014

\(^{22}\) CIDA-2 2015 Annual Report.
Across the General Secretariat, staff have received support from the DPE and CIM to integrate gender into CIDA-2 and other relevant projects. Prior to their approval, all 20 CIDA-2 projects were reviewed and evaluated by the OAS project evaluation committee to ensure that they adequately incorporated gender equality and gender concerns. Projects were also subject to ongoing review and evaluation by CIM and the DPE. Training clinics for OAS staff were offered to provide key guidelines for mainstreaming gender in projects. Overall, General Secretariat staff reported greater awareness of gender mainstreaming.

The review of CIDA-2 documents revealed that there were 40 gender-sensitive indicators for outputs and outcomes. There is ample evidence of gender-sensitive indicators in project logframes and sex-disaggregated data in project reporting. Efforts were made to provide gender-disaggregated data, particularly with respect to beneficiaries of the projects. Most projects included language such as “with a gender focus” at the end of an activity or an indicator.

However, there is a difference between disaggregating indicators by sex and including specific activities and funding dedicated to gender mainstreaming. The latter was often lacking. The portfolio review concluded that out of the 20 projects, eight fully integrated activities geared towards gender mainstreaming in their design, while 11 partially did and one not at all. Very few projects could provide evidence of outcomes related to gender mainstreaming, i.e., transformative work to promote gender equality.

Although projects CIM-1202 and CIM-1203 were specifically designed to empower women, outcomes are still unclear. In some countries visited (e.g., Dominican Republic, Panama and Paraguay), not much was happening in connection with the Belém do Pará indicators and none of the interviewees could indicate specific progress (see sidebar).

The projects below also integrated a gender perspective in their design, but whether outcomes associated with these activities have been achieved or what progress has been made is unclear due to a lack of follow-up data.

- **Project SID-1211**: Women and vulnerable groups were identified as potential beneficiaries. Training sessions were provided to women entrepreneurs with a particular emphasis on incorporating a gender perspective in the information and communication technology (ICT) training by addressing issues such as “understanding how the Digital Divide affects women and men differently.”

- **Project SID-1212**: One training module focusing on gender equality for SMEs was developed in coordination with the Inter-American Commission on Women.

- **Project SPA-1210**: Invited influential women to participate in their workshops to generate gender awareness among its national stakeholders.

---

**Work in connection with Belém do Pará indicators in Panama, Dominican Republic and Paraguay**

In Panama, high-level officials interviewed reported they had not begun working with the indicators.

In the Dominican Republic, they had a list of 92 indicators but had not yet begun the work of determining priorities, selecting indicators, or developing/specifying data sources.

In Paraguay little if any work had been carried out following a workshop held in 2015.
Project SID-1217: Innovanet supported a panel discussion of experts on women entrepreneurship in the context of the Inter-American Committee of Science and Technology. The RIAC Steering Committee created a working group on gender and women entrepreneurship.

Project SAJ-1201: According to project documents, a conscious effort was made to highlight the importance of involving women in every aspect of legal reform, as well as to procure the participation of women from civil society organizations.

Finding 7: CIDA-2 made progress in integrating results-based management principles throughout the project and program cycle. All CIDA-2 projects had results frameworks with indicators at the output and outcome levels. The main issues noted were poorly specified or overly ambitious outcomes and indicators, and the lack of baseline data and theory of change.

The review of documents suggests that the General Secretariat made considerable efforts since CIDA-1 to better integrate RBM in its projects. There was significant improvement due in part to the work of the DPE and the capacity building activities and assistance it provided. As a result, project teams understood the need to allocate funds for the collection of baseline data, which was not part of their initial plans. CIDA also played a key role in helping project teams design their results frameworks.

Some problems were apparent in project results frameworks and in the overall PMF, most notably but not exclusively at the outcome level. In developing results frameworks, one important question to be asked is, “to what extent is each of the outputs necessary and sufficient to achieve the desired outcomes?” It would seem that the sufficiency test in this question might have led to the necessity of including follow-up activities, rather than simply relying on conducting seminars to encourage change. Normally, results frameworks should be conceptualized from the top (impacts or, in this case, both “ultimate” and “intermediate” outcomes) down.

The review of documents also revealed a disconnect between project profiles and the CIDA-2 Performance Management Framework (PMF). Examples of PMF issues by Field of Intervention from document review:

- In the field of “Democracy,” better project design and clear linkage between activity-output and outcomes was needed in order to measure results.
- In the field of “Business Environment,” the lack of means of verification limited reporting. Moreover, clear linkages between output and outcomes were needed in order to measure results.
- In the field of “Institutional Strengthening,” there was limited progress reported in Summit-related activities due to inadequate specification of indicators and means of verification.

23 The sufficiency test normally encourages the inclusion of all the activities necessary, especially follow-up, in order to ensure that there is a high likelihood that outputs will lead to the achievement of the desired outcomes.

24 In the CIDA-2 “logic model,” the “ultimate outcome” – Improved democratic governance and sustainable economic growth in the Americas – does not seem to be particularly useful, since the contribution of CIDA-2 to its achievement would not be traceable. Perhaps “intermediate” or “ultimate” outcomes should be based (and so identified) on specific mandates.
Framework (PMF). As described in the OAS-Canada Cooperation Plan 2012-2015 Supplement Report, “[...] project design cannot stop with a profile, but must include the proper background and justification, the identification of the appropriate quantitative indicators to measure results, a risk analysis, and a monitoring and evaluation matrix. This should be completed before full implementation begins”. In addition, there were some orphan projects, i.e., projects that did not clearly fit in the PMF and that had no linkages beyond outputs. To fix some of these issues, a consultant was hired in 2013 to revise the PMF and indicators. While some changes were made, it was not possible to conduct a complete revision of the PMF, since the program was already into its second year of implementation.

One salient issue was that the ultimate outcome of CIDA-2 was unrealistic, and the other implicit logical links among results were not carefully designed or monitored to ensure that they were achieved. While CIDA-2 never developed an explicit theory of change (ToC), interviewed stakeholders felt the implicit theory was far too ambitious given the scope and resources of CIDA-2. With less than CAD 20 million over three years, and with more than 30 countries to cover, CIDA-2’s contribution to “improved democratic governance and sustainable economic growth” (CIDA-2 ultimate outcome) seems unrealistic and is not traceable. In addition, project results frameworks committed to results the project teams did not have sufficient time to achieve. According to stakeholders interviewed, this lack of focus of CIDA-2 was partly due to the desire to “share the pie and keep many people happy.” Project design was incomplete and did not include important assumptions, risks, or a management strategy. Risks were never outlined and assumptions for the achievement of results were described in only five project profiles. Many of the outcome-level indicators were weak, overambitious and/or unrealistic, e.g. implementation of a model law.

Even in the case of “immediate outcomes” and their corresponding indicators, the PMF was weak, overly ambitious, and/or poorly-specified. For example:

- Immediate outcome: “Increased knowledge by SMEs, working mainly in the extractive sector, of CSR and responsible business practices which enhance productivity, competitiveness and market access.”
- Indicator: “# of responsible business practices undertaken by trained SMEs.” Baseline: “0.” Target: “20.”

Do these indicators meet the SMART criteria? Note that for that indicator, we do not have enough information to apply each of the SMART criteria. For example, in connection with Specific, what exactly constitutes a single “responsible business practice?” Measurable would require specifying what minimum period of time implemented would be required in order to consider a responsible business practice as having been “undertaken?” In regard to Achievable, to determine if this criterion is met would require, in addition to the foregoing elements, analyzing similar experiences to judge viability or likelihood of reaching the target, given the number of participants in a given workshop. This would not normally be considered an indicator of an “immediate outcome.” Regarding Time-bound, the indicator lacks any specification of time, although having been labelled an “immediate outcome,” presumably it would begin to be observed shortly following a given CSR workshop. But with little or no follow-up, Achievable is highly questionable.

25 Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound.
The Means of Verification for the immediate outcome noted above include “meeting reports; annual institutional reports’ and “inventories of required changes; documents describing institutional changes.” Strictly speaking, these are entirely too generic.

In the Performance Measurement Frameworks for CIDA-2 projects, some baselines were “to be determined” and targets were not available in four projects. In the PMF, means of verification were not adequately identified and the overall quality of outcome indicators was generally poor. Some output indicators could be considered indicators of immediate outcomes. This refers simply to indicator baselines and targets; for example, it does not refer to completeness (or sufficiency) in the design of outputs. In final CIDA-2 reports in 2015, four of the 20 projects reviewed did not have baselines or had incomplete baselines, and data on outcome progress was either not available or only partially available in 13 projects. See Table 4.3 below for some details on output and outcome indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME INDICATORS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PARTIALLY</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline available</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets available</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on progress available</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTPUT INDICATORS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PARTIALLY</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline available</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets available</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on progress available</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutionalizing RBM in the General Secretariat

Finding 8: CIDA-2 led to the partial institutionalization of an RBM culture in the General Secretariat. Staff involved acquired some skills in managing for development results and greater awareness of the benefits of managing through an RBM approach, but considerably more work is needed in this regard. Other General Secretariat activities are not managed in this manner, which indicates that the OAS is still struggling to fully adopt an RBM managerial approach.

Since CIDA-1, there have been many improvements at the OAS in terms of RBM. CIDA-1 made a significant impact on the institutional capacity by introducing the fundamental planning and monitoring methodologies imposed by the Cooperation Plan and the General Secretariat adopted the Logic Framework, outputs, outcomes and indicators in program and project planning. CIDA-2 introduced the Performance Measurement Framework and other tools that improved the General Secretariat’s ability to develop relevant and measurable projects. Many OAS staff were trained thanks to CIDA-2 funding.
Interview data suggest there is a changed mindset at the General Secretariat among staff involved in CIDA-2. They indicated they are more aware about RBM and project design and tend to be more realistic about what they can deliver in a set timeframe. The CIDA-2 experience has taught them that they need to plan results that are achievable. OAS staff are now thinking about budgeting for surveys or extra support to collect data throughout a project life cycle.

However, interviews also suggest that there is little if any RBM culture at the General Secretariat outside of CIDA-2 and work sponsored by other donors such as Spain and the USA. Although this could not be verified through document review, interviews suggest that RBM is not applied to most OAS-funded activities. According to stakeholders interviewed, the main reason is that there have been no incentives from senior management to manage for results, but, more importantly, RBM has been perceived as hard to implement in an organization that is fundamentally political and where decisions on whether to undertake a project are subject to imponderables (i.e., requests from Member States). There is a general perception throughout the General Secretariat that, as a political organization, it should not be required to measure results as would a development organization. There is reluctance to specify indicators for policy work given the perception that results of that nature cannot be measured. However, the OAS adheres to the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action, which both call for the measurement of results.

### 4.4 Intermediate/Ultimate Outcomes

**Finding 9:** It does not appear at all likely that CIDA-2 will achieve its intermediate nor its ultimate outcomes. Overly ambitious outcomes, lack of follow-up and the dispersion of resources across many small projects in several countries may have limited the achievement of higher-level results.

Generally, the document review found limitations in the use of the CIDA-2 Performance Measurement Framework. At the ultimate and intermediate outcome levels, determining attribution is difficult. Ultimate outcome indicators generally reflect changes in the economy and society that cannot be measured until some time after a project is complete, and those that were specified cannot be attributed to, or even traced to, any single project or program. Intermediate outcomes are often not apparent until after project implementation, and it is very difficult to specify or measure outcomes that occur during implementation. CIDA-2 ended in September 2015, when the third year of activities were complete. The Final Report by the OAS was done as CIDA-2 ended and this is why it is also very difficult to actually determine if, or to what extent, outcomes were achieved.

Project teams used the CIDA-2 PMF to measure effectiveness, with mixed results. In 12 out of 22 projects, there was no data to assess intermediate and immediate outcomes. Of the five intermediate outcomes, three did not have sufficient data to determine their achievement, and two were reportedly partially achieved.
Table 4.4  Achievement of Intermediate and Immediate Outcomes by Field of Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>FINAL STATUS OF OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>Strengthened implementation of elections, focusing on gender equality considerations in targeted countries</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business environment</td>
<td>Increased progress towards implementation of policies and regulatory frameworks and instruments that stimulate sustainable economic growth, particularly in areas of competitiveness, innovation and MSMEs, in targeted countries</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to markets</td>
<td>Increased opportunities provided by member states to businesses to access national, regional and global markets</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality instruments</td>
<td>Strengthened application of human rights instruments related to gender equality</td>
<td>No data to determine achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Strengthening</td>
<td>Improved effectiveness of the OAS in fulfilling its mandate to support democratic governance and sustainable economic growth</td>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Finding 7, stakeholders interviewed felt that CIDA-2’s higher-level results were too ambitious considering the amount of funding and time available. Several stakeholders indicated that fewer and more focused projects would help. While dispersion of resources across many small projects is an issue, the evaluation team feels an equally important issue is the broad leap between intermediate outcomes and the ultimate outcome and the lack of clearly articulated assumptions on which the logic is based.

Although CIDA-2 did not achieve its higher level outcomes, there is some evidence of promising outcomes and important changes. For example, in Project SPA-1211, the implementation of quality management systems for the administration of elections at a national level has had regional impact. The OAS reported seeing a ripple effect across the region as electoral bodies in one country learned of the ISO electoral certification of their counterparts in another country, and then followed their example by requesting the General Secretariat’s assistance to implement a quality management system. In some cases, electoral management bodies from different countries have shared best practices. For instance, officials from the Consejo Nacional Electoral of Ecuador travelled to the Dominican Republic to learn from the certification experience of the Junta Central Electoral.

In retrospect, it was ambitious from our part to think that in three years it could all be accomplished.

- Project Team Member, General Secretariat, Washington

Lack of monitoring and follow-up

Overall, evidence of achievement of higher-level outcomes (i.e., intermediate and ultimate) remains anecdotal given the brief time since completion of CIDA-2, the
absence of properly specified indicators, and the lack of monitoring and follow-up, which, as noted in Finding 5, is one of the main issues with the PMF and the achievement of outcomes. Once an activity is carried out, it is assumed that the use of knowledge or information provided by the OAS will be applied. The General Secretariat has little control over final results.

The evaluation team believes that lack of follow-up may be due to one or all of following factors:

- Inadequate project planning, in this case at the Activity/Output level
- Lack of exploration or use of low-cost alternatives to sending consultants to the countries, such as videoconferencing
- Lack of in-house capacity of the General Secretariat in certain technical areas, which would have required external consultants to provide any substantive or technical follow-up services.

During country visits, the evaluation team noted the following issues with follow-up on CIDA-2 projects:

- Project SID-1207 in Jamaica: The only activity undertaken was a regional workshop organized by the OAS in 2015 attended by many participants from countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. Interviewed participants said that they valued the workshop and the presenters, and that they made connections during the workshop, but that they did not take any actions following the workshop that could have led to higher level changes.
- Project SAJ-1201 in El Salvador: Consulted stakeholders explained that after the project ended the OAS did not provide the planned support related to technological and legal components required to establish online access to information tools.
- Project SAJ-1203 in Jamaica: While stakeholders reported being more aware of the law on secured transactions as a result of the project, they noted that there has been very little progress in increasing access to credit for SMEs because of other factors such as limited capacities of the Government for implementation and the lack of an enabling environment.
- Project CIM-1202: The project team does not yet have information on whether in-country partners are using the data collected by the MESECVI. This is mainly due to a lack of capacity of the CIM Secretariat to engage in monitoring and follow-up efforts. Effort and assistance are still required for Member States to be able to collect all of the data contemplated in the MESECVI system of indicators.

### 4.5 Unintended Results

**Finding 10:** CIDA-2 supported the creation of networks and helped lay the foundation for new laws and electoral reform. It also helped some project partners carry out activities they had planned but lacked sufficient resources to implement.

During country visits, the evaluation team learned about a few unintended results, i.e. results that were not planned as part of specific projects, but these were anecdotal. In Mexico and Costa Rica, partners mentioned that they had wished or planned to carry out projects similar to CIDA-2 projects but did not have sufficient resources. CIDA-2 funding helped them progress more rapidly.
The review of documents also identified evidence of unintended results in six of the 20 CIDA-2 projects. These mainly have to do with new opportunities that were not foreseeable at the project design stage.

- **Project SAJ-1201**: In Argentina, a draft law on access to information was put forward shortly after an OAS seminar was organized in Buenos Aires on this topic. While this cannot be attributed directly to CIDA-2, it seems to indicate some degree of influence.

- **Project SID-1217**: The second regional meeting of Red Innovanet in Guatemala (March 2015) consolidated formal exchanges among the different technology transfer networks in the Americas. These efforts led to the launch of a Latin American and Caribbean Network of Networks of Innovation and Technology Transfer (Red de Redes).

- **Project SID-1210**: CIDA-2 funding supported a two-week course on trade negotiation at George Washington University in Washington, DC for government officials from different countries. An unintended result of this course was the creation of informal networks. According to consulted participants, these networks have been beneficial as participants can liaise informally to discuss matters related to trade negotiation among participating countries. While the course was very resource-intensive (in terms of airfare, hotel, and per diems for the participants), a virtual course would not have fostered lasting relationships among government officials from different countries, which, according to interviewed participants, was one of the most important results of the course.
5 Efficiency of CIDA-2

Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. (OECD-DAC Definition)

**Key message**: The planned management structure of CIDA-2 was an improvement compared to CIDA-1. The CIDA-1 evaluation reported coordination problems and management inefficiencies due to the lack of supervision by a single entity. This void was, in principle, adequately filled in CIDA-2 by a comprehensive management structure that included a steering committee and a technical secretariat. This arrangement worked better in terms of coordination, but after some time, senior management lost interest in CIDA-2 and the DPE took more of a leadership position. The implementation of CIDA-2 followed the terms of the Grant Arrangement with Canada, but multiple flaws in the design of projects, such as overambitious outcomes or lack of follow-up led to inefficiencies. The use of external consultants to implement CIDA-2 projects indicates that the General Secretariat used considerable CIDA-2 resources to augment its capacity at headquarters and to implement projects for which it did not have readily available technical capacities. The General Secretariat was able to address or partially address five out of ten recommendations of the CIDA-1 evaluation.

### 5.1 Design and Management Issues

**Finding 11**: Overall, the design of CIDA-2 had flaws, including vague selection criteria, overambitious outcomes and unclear results chains, and inefficient allocation of financial and human resources.

**Project selection**: As noted in Section 3 on Relevance, interviews in countries showed that a majority of projects were supply-driven, i.e., selected by project coordinators and staff at the General Secretariat in Washington. With very few exceptions, Canadian embassy officers and staff of OAS Country Offices lacked any knowledge of the various projects included in CIDA-2, and government offices that presumably “coordinate” external technical cooperation also lacked this information, so this was clearly not a demand-driven selection process. While a supply-driven process may be more efficient at the outset, it may not lead to the most relevant or sustainable results.

**Design**: The evaluation team is of the opinion that CIDA-2 projects were designed on a project-by-project basis, rather than as a package of complementary projects that work together towards the achievement of desired outcomes. In addition, as noted in Finding 7, CIDA-2 outcomes were overly ambitious and projects lacked clear results chains.

Some CIDA-2 projects “piggy-backed” on ongoing OAS efforts and were restructured to fit CIDA-2 requirements. For the work on Summits of the Americas, on civil society organizations or gender, CIDA-2 was a way to obtain resources to implement OAS mandates. According to interviews, it proved somewhat difficult for these ongoing projects to develop a set of indicators adapted to the CIDA-2 PMF.
**Allocation of financial and human resources:** CIDA-2 resources were allocated to 20 projects sprinkled across many countries, and this may not have been the most efficient use of CAD 20 million. Because the General Secretariat staff could not provide important and technically-advanced substantive backing in such a multitude of areas and to so many countries, it had to hire short-term consultants and new staff to implement CIDA-2. The new staff came with new ideas and wishes to change the PMF. In addition, very few, if any, resources were allocated for follow-up, which affects sustainability. As observed during country visits, most projects put people together during punctual events (supported face-to-face relationships), but were not designed to have long-term impacts or to encourage lasting relationships.

**Finding 12:** The efficiency of CIDA-2 was affected by some delays in project start-up and the cost of short-term contracts, in areas in which the OAS did not have expertise, which represented approximately 42 per cent of the overall resources of the Cooperation Plan.

Initially, it took longer than expected to plan and develop the Cooperation Plan, mainly because project teams presented their project profiles late and the General Secretariat had to present a complete and coherent program. This caused delays in disbursements and activities during the first year of implementation. Other delays by field of intervention are noted below.

**Table 5.1 Delays by Field of Intervention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELDS OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>BARRIERS TO ON-TIME DELIVERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>• The OAS department in charge had three different directors and high staff turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reformulation of activities and budget due to change in priorities, which led to delays in the identification of baseline data and affected the timely execution of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment</td>
<td>• Some projects were reformulated after the design phase was completed (e.g., CooperaNet and the CSR project).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Underestimation of bureaucratic procedures in Member States when selecting beneficiaries or partner organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Markets</td>
<td>• Poor planning of data collection led to delays in setting goals in the short term and in gathering evidence on results achieved in the medium term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delays in the development or completion of tasks (survey design, access to data sources and collection of beneficiary data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• Delays in obtaining a positive response from the 6 targeted countries to participate in CIDA-2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slow progress towards delivery of outputs, as well as limited progress in achieving targets set for the immediate outcome indicators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIELDS OF INTERVENTION | BARRIERS TO ON-TIME DELIVERY
--- | ---
OAS Institutional Strengthening | • Activities linked to high-level political processes and other stakeholder consultations (e.g., the Summit Implementation Review Group, Underrepresented Electoral Groups, and Civil Society Organizations) led to significant delays in the execution of activities and resources. These delays are due to the political nature of the components as well as a lack of synchronization between the OAS/CP timeframe and the OAS political processes.

However, the main efficiency issue as reported by stakeholders interviewed was the high cost of hiring short-term external consultants to carry out work for which the General Secretariat did not have the capacity or in-house expertise. The total cost of short-term contracts issued to implement CIDA-2 represented approximately 42 per cent of the overall budget of the Cooperation Plan or USD 8,153,665. This indicates that the General Secretariat used considerable CIDA-2 resources to augment its capacity at headquarters and to implement projects for which it did not have readily available technical capacities. It also may account somewhat for the lack of follow-up activities, since they would also require consultant time. The sustainability of the work carried out by external consultants is also questionable since their expertise is lost once a project is completed.

As shown in Table 5.2 below, five projects relied on performance contracts (or short-term contracts) for more than 70 per cent of their activities. These include Project SER-1201 (on increased awareness of the importance of responsible business practices), Project SER-1202 (on responsible business practices), Project SID-1212 (on Corporate Social Responsibility, and Projects CIM-1202 and CIM-1203 (work on gender mainstreaming).

Projects that generally focused on OAS main strengths or core activities did not require such high budget allocations for short-term contracts, e.g., work with electoral management bodies (Project SPA-1211), work on electoral observations (Project SPA-1216), and work on commercial arbitration (Project SAJ-1202).

**Table 5.2 Performance Contracts by Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF BUDGET ALLOCATED TO PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIM-1202</td>
<td>573,492</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIM-1203</td>
<td>894,466</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-1201</td>
<td>1,034,775</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJ-1201</td>
<td>408,171</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJ-1202</td>
<td>565,145</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJ-1203</td>
<td>424,166</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJ-1204</td>
<td>556,024</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER-1201</td>
<td>308,030</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER-1202</td>
<td>227,474</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EVALUATION OF OAS/CIDA COOPERATION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF BUDGET ALLOCATED TO PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SID-1207</td>
<td>290,591</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID-1210</td>
<td>579,338</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID-1211</td>
<td>1,523,046</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID-1212</td>
<td>852,785</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID-1217</td>
<td>585,632</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA-1208</td>
<td>1,589,925</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA-1210</td>
<td>874,945</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA-1211</td>
<td>1,505,147</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA-1215</td>
<td>461,137</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA-1216</td>
<td>425,662</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM-1201</td>
<td>694,980</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During country visits, however, it was evident that the OAS was able to leverage resources from its partners and project participants. Most partners contributed through staff time and some financing to carry out projects. For example:

- **Project SPA-1211**: Electoral Management Bodies paid for members of their staff to participate in training courses on ISO electoral technical specification organized by General Secretariat (approx. $500 per participant). The Dominican Junta Central Electoral and the Oficina Nacional de Procesos Electorales of Peru supported these courses by offering their facilities as venues for the workshops and by financing the training materials, food and transportation for international participants.

- **Project SAJ-1201**: The Supreme Court of Costa Rica made financial or in-kind contributions (e.g., staff time) to CIDA-2 projects to advance the model law on International Commercial Arbitration.

- **Project SID-1211**: Stakeholders interviewed indicated that the project enhanced its efficiency by working with a regional entity, the Regional Center for the Promotion of MSMEs (CENPROMYPE), to develop tools and training that would then be offered in the eight countries where the Center operates (including in El Salvador). This approach resulted in savings and reduced the learning curve for trainers.

Finally, some interviewees reported that the use of video-conferences would be far more cost-efficient than regional or national workshops, would save on travel costs, would reach many more people, and the corresponding savings would perhaps permit more follow-up activities. However, the General Secretariat currently has limited capacity for using this and other more efficient technologies.
Finding 13: The General Secretariat put a great deal of effort into the management and implementation of CIDA-2 and respected the terms of the Grant Arrangement with the Government of Canada. Some activities were modified and funds reallocated, all with appropriate justification. However, most CIDA-2 projects websites showed low utilization and updates.

Overall CIDA-2 was managed professionally by the Technical Secretariat and Canadian government staff reported positive interactions and efficient collaboration throughout CIDA-2.

The evaluation team found that all the main requirements of the Grant Arrangement between CIDA and the OAS were implemented by the General Secretariat. For example, a project Management Plan was developed and annual narrative reports followed the agreed-upon template. Annual narrative reports detailed activities undertaken and progress and results achieved and contained information on progress on gender programming. Financial reporting was provided in each Annual Report. Final project reports were completed and most were made available to the evaluation team for review. The Canadian Government showed some dissatisfaction with the reporting on results by the General Secretariat. Reporting requirements could have been made clearer by sharing more detailed and specific reporting formats. Global Affairs Canada gave a grant to the OAS to implement the Cooperation Plan, but it could have had more control and demanded more accountability from the General Secretariat with a different payment mechanism such as a grant contribution for instance.

Based on the documents reviewed, some CIDA-2 project teams requested a reallocation of resources and justified the reasons prior to approval. The main reasons for the reallocation of resources were:

- **Changes in costs of planned activities:** Project SAJ-1202 had insufficient funds to carry out the workshop planned in St. Lucia due to cost overruns related to a planned publication. The publication of essays on the topics discussed in training sessions cost twice as much as had been budgeted, due to the overwhelming interest from international experts in contributing essays. As a result, the publication increased from the estimated 300 pages to 550 pages, with resulting increases in the cost of design and print.

- **Additional resources received from other donors:** Project CIM-1202 received a contribution from the Government of Mexico (valued at approximately USD 60,000) to organize an international expert group meeting; as a result, the CIDA-2 resources for this activity were reallocated to the organization of a meeting on “Women's human rights: Good practices in gender justice” held in collaboration with the Supreme Court of Justice of Argentina. The meeting also received financial support (USD 15,000) and in-kind contribution (valued at approximately USD 30,000) from the Government of Argentina.

### Table 5.3  Budget Reallocations by Field of Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>REALLOCATION (USD)</th>
<th>% OF OVERALL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>124,572</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment</td>
<td>175,274</td>
<td>Approximately 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Markets</td>
<td>52,030</td>
<td>Approximately 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS Institutional Strengthening</td>
<td>298,788</td>
<td>Approximately 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The small changes required to modify a deliverable or activity may appear minimal, but the work required to process and approve these changes was consequential (e.g., reformulation of activities in project documents, budget reallocation processed by DFAMS, approvals by DPE and Technical Secretariat). It is good that small reallocations require these processes, because it tends to discourage the reallocations.

**Project websites**

The evaluation team did not find specific guidance or protocols regarding the harmonization and standardization of CIDA-2 project websites. The ways in which CIDA-2 project websites were set up and used appears uneven. Out of 20 projects, 13 set up specific websites for CIDA-2 related projects. Of those 13, five did not show clear signs of activity or recent updates. The proliferation of websites may reduce the likelihood that their use will justify the expense of setting them up. The amount of resources spent on developing website for projects is not always clearly described in project documents. Out of the 13 projects that had set up a website, resources spent were available or partially available for only six projects only. Sometimes, the amounts showed in budget for websites combined other items such as brochures or banners. It is not possible to tell what portion when to the website. When more precise figures are available, they vary tremendously. Project CIM-1202 budgeted almost USD 100,000 to establish an online platform for a community of practice and an online compendium of resource, while project SID-1212 budgeted USD 12,000 to develop an online platform for the CSR community of practice. This all points to the fact that the very rationale for the development of a new website should be better assessed and thought through before investing considerable resources.

Websites were developed for a variety of reasons, and with varying degrees of success, as shown below.

**Websites as networking tools or for communities of practice**

- For project SID-1211, a networking platform was developed to facilitate horizontal cooperation and exchange of experiences among institutions working with MSMEs in Central America.
- The Project SER-1202 website was designed to facilitate communication among stakeholders on responsible business practices.
- The Project SID-1212 website, which was planned for a community of practice on corporate social responsibility, is online and operational, but the community is basically non-existent.

Websites linked to the development of communities of practice seem to be the most difficult to set up and sustain. The community has to be built and has to be fed something about which to interact and discuss. It is not enough to provide a repository of books or publications. Without any input, community members have very little incentive to go back to the website. The time required to facilitate discussions and encourage participation must be taken into consideration in budgeting and designing outputs for online communities of practice. Considerable effort is required to generate results and evidence of sustainability.

**Website for exchange of alerts**

- Project SID-1217 developed the Inter-American Rapid Alert System (SIAR) to identify consumer product safety alerts so that OAS Member States can take measures to prevent or stop a product from being sold. It is an integrated system that involves interaction between relevant agencies in Member States.
Websites as an informative tool

- The Belém do Pará website (Project CIM-1202) documents good practices and provides monitoring data on violence against women to all Member States.
- The Project SAJ-1201 website includes relevant jurisprudence, laws and draft laws from 32 OAS Member States, as well as documents approved by the OAS organs and international conferences (same as SAJ-1202). The documentary film, publications of seminar proceedings and secured transactions website for SAJ-1201 serves as a useful resource to disseminate information.
- The website for the Consumer Product and Health Network (CSHN) and SIAR for project SID-1217 is reportedly used extensively by the Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Comercio (MEIC) in Costa Rica. The database that can be accessed from the website is used by the Ministry for all consumer recall procedures. It also allows the MEIC to track data and produce reports.

5.2 Financial system and efficiency findings

Finding 14: CIDA-2’s financial reporting systems were sharper than CIDA-1’s and allowed project managers to know where resources went and to have real time access to budgetary information. However, there are still serious limitations in the General Secretariat’s financial systems.

The evaluation of CIDA-1 noted that there was insufficient access to budgetary information. Following a specific request from the Government of Canada, the financial system was improved in CIDA-2 and information was made available on travel, personnel time, etc. During CIDA-2, project teams received quarterly reports that gave them information for making project decisions and they knew when disbursements were required.

Nevertheless, General Secretariat staff reported that their financial systems are still inadequate for reporting on a program such as CIDA-2: financial systems are not connected internally; there are separate systems for budgeting and financial follow up; and the General Secretariat still works in Excel, which is not considered the best software for accounting purposes. Although CIDA-2 had fewer outputs than CIDA-1 (reduced from 70 to 37), which reduced the number of transactions for the General Secretariat financial team, calculating the availability of funds for one CIDA-2 output still required 1½ hours and two persons and converting currencies from CAD to USD must be done manually. The system is not able to track costs by outcome, but this is not uncommon for organizations such as the OAS.

The financial department has to deal with over 500 different agreements with different donors and partners, each of whom has its own requirements. Currently, the General Secretariat lacks resources to improve its financial system and become a more efficient organization.

Finding 15: The CIDA-2 monitoring mechanisms did not always facilitate data collection for activities and outputs. Data on outcomes was not collected after implementation as no mechanism was put in place to do so.

The main tools to monitor CIDA-2’s progress towards results were:

- Performance Measurement Framework (PMF) which includes 148 Indicators
- Logic Model (LM) which includes 33 result statements
- Gender recommendations from CIM and DPE on projects
- Bi-Annual Activity Progress Reports (RPPI)

The Logic Model and Performance Measurement Framework were the central documents guiding the M&E strategy of CIDA-2. To operationalize the strategy, the DPE reviewed all results chains at the project level to ensure proper logic, clearly identified beneficiaries, integration of gender perspective, budget required to establish baselines and monitor targets. CIDA also hired a consultant to help re-work the RBM tools.

In this collection of small projects, outcomes can only be observed after implementation, which means that they cannot be monitored. In CIDA-2 projects, monitoring unavoidably centered on activities and outputs. Although project teams made an effort to compile information to measure the progress of indicators at the outcome level, some of the methods of data collection used were not valid, and thus, did not allow for the verification of most results at this level. This is due in part to the fact that usually, as stated above, outcomes can only be observed a few years after implementation. Document review did not show clear follow-up tools or mechanisms for outcomes in at least 15 out of 20 projects.

The monitoring of outputs was also a challenge. For instance, the Business Environment field of intervention, one of the largest and most varied components of CIDA-2, contained various projects compacted under one output (e.g., networks), which led to understated or overstated targets, i.e., by merging participants in a wide range of activities, it was not possible to have a clear picture of the results obtained or what worked and what did not.

In addition, General Secretariat IT/Project Monitoring system is not data-oriented; reports are prepared using word processing software rather than database software, which further complicates monitoring of projects.

### Example of Monitoring Challenge: Project SUM-1201

In order to collect data at the level of outcomes, the project team carried out a quantitative survey following the VI Summit in 2012. Following that Summit, the General Secretariat changed its approach and developed a qualitative survey to better assess its work and receive more concrete recommendations for improvement. This change to the data collection and analysis did not correspond to the indicators included in CIDA-2’s PMF. As a result, progress could not be verified.

### 5.3 Follow up on Previous Evaluation

**Finding 16:** The General Secretariat addressed, or partially addressed, five of the ten recommendations of the CIDA-1 evaluation. Two recommendations require consensus from Member States (on strategic planning and harmonization of reporting). Other recommendations that have not been addressed include the need for demand-driven project identification and better follow-up of activities.

Following the evaluation of CIDA-1, the DPE management response noted that two recommendations could not be addressed because they were broader than CIDA-1 and required reaching consensus.
among Member States. They included the development of a strategic plan for the General Secretariat and the harmonization of reporting requirements by donors.

Other recommendations that were not addressed and that remain relevant for the evaluation of CIDA-2 include the recommended move towards a demand-driven process for the identification of projects and better follow-up activities, in particular for capacity building interventions.

It is worth noting that although these recommendations were not fully addressed, the lines of responsibilities and supervision for CIDA-2 were clarified and RBM principles were integrated in the design of all CIDA-2 projects based on recommendations from the CIDA-1 evaluation.

One recommendation of the CIDA-1 evaluation suggested prioritizing successful lines of action for future Cooperation Plans. Gender equality seems to have become a priority, but it remains unclear whether other successful lines of action were also prioritized.

### Table 5.4 Status of Recommendations of CIDA-1 Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIDA-1 RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>STILL A CIDA-2 ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The General Secretariat should facilitate building a strategic partnership with donors by establishing an internal monitoring and evaluation mechanism.</td>
<td>Not entirely addressed, but the General Secretariat is working on it.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Secretariat should develop a short-term strategic plan, including a rationale and explicit program or project intervention logic that clearly explains how OAS programming is intended to contribute to results (immediate, intermediate and final outcomes).</td>
<td>Not addressed due to a lack of consensus among Member States.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Secretariat should structure a centralized overall Cooperation Plan management system to clarify lines of responsibility and supervision and reduce transaction costs.</td>
<td>Addressed. A Project Management Plan describes the different responsibility lines. The Joint Steering Committee did not function according to agreed-upon roles and responsibilities during the final year of implementation.</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Secretariat should front-load RBM/MfDR and strengthen DPE as the RBM/MfDR focal point. RBM/MfDR principles should be applied to any future Cooperation Plans from inception.</td>
<td>Addressed. A PMF and logic models were developed and used.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within CIDA’s general guidelines governing a new Cooperation Plan, the General Secretariat should prioritize “successful” lines of action conducted under the first Cooperation Plan.</td>
<td>Somewhat addressed in relation to gender equality; however, CIDA-2 focused on multiple “new” lines of action.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Secretariat should find appropriate mechanisms to encourage a more demand-based approach to project selection.</td>
<td>Not addressed. The General Secretariat is exploring a new project identification model but it has not been implemented.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIDA-1 RECOMMENDATION | STATUS | STILL A CIDA-2 ISSUE
---|---|---
The General Secretariat should rethink all Cooperation Plan-financed capacity building and technical assistance activities – including approaches designed to effectively strengthen targeted agencies and organizations – by moving away from individual-focused activities to agency-focused training. Follow-up activities should be incorporated in every capacity building activity conducted by the General Secretariat. | Not addressed. Although there are some efforts to include more sustainable components in projects (e.g., training of trainers), they have not shown improved results. | Yes
The General Secretariat should continue developing its communications strategy and prioritize the streamlining and upgrading of websites and collaborative networks that have clearly shown effectiveness and eliminate those that have not. | Addressed, through the reorganization of the Secretariat for External Relations and the definition of better norms and standards. | Partially
Provision of equipment in/through a Cooperation Plan-financed OAS project should be appropriately justified as necessary to address problems within the project’s specific purview and to achieve or contribute to specific project outcomes. | Seems to have been addressed; no evidence of unjustified provision of equipment in CIDA-2. | No
CIDA should provide consistent oversight of any future Cooperation Plan. | Not fully addressed. Following the amalgamation of CIDA and DFAIT, the Agency provided limited oversight during the CIDA-2 period. | Yes

5.4 Governance and leadership

Finding 17: Leadership of CIDA-2 varied throughout the grant period. During the first two years, Senior Management exercised oversight, while in the third year, leadership was mostly delegated to the DPE. The General Secretariat did not implement the governance structure in conformity with the Project Management Plan.

The CIDA-2 governance structure as described in the Project Management Plan was clearly articulated. Interviews confirm that governance roles and responsibilities were transparent and well understood. As time went by, however, CIDA-2 management at the General Secretariat and Canadian government seemed to have lost interest. This was due, in part, to high rotation of staff in both CIDA and Permanent Missions, and also because the then Secretary General and his managerial team were in the final months of their mandate.

Given this situation, management of CIDA-2 was assigned to the DPE because of its familiarity with both CIDA-1 and CIDA-2 and its design of monitoring systems and other related capabilities. Interviewees both inside and outside the General Secretariat suggest that the DPE managed CIDA-2 effectively, in spite of the fact that it fell outside its mandate and that, as an evaluation unit, DPE is supposed to be more independent.
The Joint Steering Committee met annually, three times during the course of CIDA-2. The minutes of these meetings confirm a change in attendance over time. High level General Secretariat representatives attended Joint Steering Committee meetings in the first two years, but not in the third year. The review of the minutes also indicated that discussions of the Joint Steering Committee were not strategic (see sidebar).

Finding 18: The oversight provided by the representative of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS was considered very satisfactory.

According to the CIDA-2 Project Management Plan, representatives from CIDA were expected to provide leadership and advice regarding the orientation and implementation of the different components of CIDA-2 and the achievement of outputs and outcomes through their participation on the Joint Steering Committee. This leadership was mostly provided by Representatives of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS in Washington. Stakeholders interviewed confirmed that they were satisfied with the type of oversight provided by the Representatives of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS. The Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS attended all Joint Steering Committee Meetings and was involved in the discussions on CIDA-2. The review of Joint Steering Committee minutes showed that the discussion were mostly administrative in nature and not strategic (see textbox).

Analysis of Minutes of Joint Steering Committee Meetings

Joint-Steering Committee meetings were used primarily as a channel to communicate information on CIDA-2 rather than as a forum for discussion and debate on strategic issues. At the second and third meetings in 2013 and 2014, OAS representatives gave updates on CIDA-2 projects and the status of deliverables.

The Committee made limited recommendations to improve the efficiency of CIDA-2, and these were mostly technical in nature (e.g., inclusion of “the overall execution amount used to cover salaries in the annual reports and in the final reports”). Indeed, according to minutes reviewed, no strategic discussion was initiated on the implementation of CIDA-2 and the various activities implemented were not mentioned.

Decisions taken by the Joint-Steering Committee were neither strategically focused nor results-oriented.

Finding 19: In-country partners such as Government ministries were very satisfied with their interactions with the General Secretariat. However, Canadian embassy staff and most OAS staff in country offices had never heard of the Cooperation Plan or its projects.

Almost all partners interviewed in-country were very satisfied with their interactions with the General Secretariat (e.g., frequency of contact, General Secretariat staff perceived as approachable and available, etc.) This was particularly true of organizations that had long-standing relationships with the OAS and who were able to keep open channels of communication with the General Secretariat even after the CIDA-2 project had concluded. In some cases, however, the General Secretariat in Washington gave very short prior notice that a project was about to commence in the country. Stakeholders commented that if substantive support was expected from them, requests for support should have been made earlier.

In the countries visited for the evaluation there was virtually no knowledge of CIDA-2 other than from project participants, and some of these did not know much about CIDA-2. Canadian embassy staff, persons responsible for the coordination of technical support, and most OAS staff in Country Offices had
never heard about the Cooperation Plan or its projects. It is unclear why they were not informed, but the fact that most CIDA-2 activities were managed out of Washington may be a reason. Canadian embassy staff interviewed in Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic and Panama had no knowledge of CIDA-2, the projects it financed, the beneficiaries, which projects took place in the countries in which they were posted, or the results of activities such as workshops. Interaction was limited to participation of Canadian ambassadors at some (perhaps not all) inaugural sessions of workshops financed by CIDA-2. In other countries, Canadian embassies, when they participated in projects, did not receive any reporting on the results of these activities.

Consulted OAS Offices in Member States did not know any details about CIDA-2, its various projects, nor did they receive information from HQ regarding the activities undertaken in their countries. HQ staff did not seek their opinions regarding which CIDA-2-financed projects might benefit the country. This was also noted in the evaluation of CIDA-1. Moreover, knowledge about CIDA-2 among country delegations to the OAS remains to be determined.

The most worrying aspect of the lack of visibility of CIDA-2 in countries is that some agencies coordinating technical assistance in-country were not aware that the OAS was carrying out development projects in their countries. This is particularly worthy of note in countries such as Costa Rica and Mexico, where all development cooperation projects must be registered in a centralized database (see sidebar).

In Costa Rica, it is required by law to register all international cooperation projects with MIDEPLAN, a registry that has been in existence since 2009. All international organizations should be aware of it by now.

MIDEPLAN produces annual reports on international cooperation in Costa Rica. Discovering that the OAS is conducting projects through its own channels was somewhat upsetting to MIDEPLAN when it realized that its annual reports were incomplete. This was perceived as a major issue by MIDEPLAN: if OAS projects are not known by government institutions, the benefits of the Cooperation Plan are never tracked, the alignment with country priorities is unclear, and there could be duplication of efforts.
6 Sustainability of CIDA-2

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. (OECD-DAC Definition)

Key message: The evaluation of CIDA-1 found that the likelihood of sustainability was greater for projects that supported OAS core functions. The evaluation of CIDA-2 came to the same conclusion. The evaluation of CIDA-1 also reported a general lack of post-activity follow-up for management purposes and to determine the extent to which the activities might have benefitted partners. Follow-up was also a major concern for CIDA-2 as it was not planned nor budgeted for. The lack of follow-up may have been due to at least two main factors: 1) over-use of external consultants due to a lack of in-house capacity; and 2) project design flaws in not specifying follow-up as an integral part of delivery of outputs. In addition, the dependency on CIDA-2 funds in some General Secretariat departments allowed a number of these departments to grow in size and in scope, but no long-term planning was done to ensure that this growth would be sustainable.

Finding 20: The sustainability of project results appears to be minimal. There are several reasons for this: a) project outputs, size and scope (mostly workshops) were not appropriate to lead to longer-term results; b) project design, which in many cases did not include follow-up; and c) project teams were not expected to try to leverage additional funds beyond resources provided by CIDA-2.

The evaluation assessed the extent to which CIDA-2 increased the likelihood of continued benefits from its portfolio of development investments. The review of project documents found that there was no sustainability plan for 17 of the 20 projects. This means that there was no technical assistance or budgetary provisions to finance sustainable results.

Based on interviews and documents reviewed, CIDA-2 projects had a higher degree of sustainability when they were in areas in which the General Secretariat had a long history of implementing projects and programs (e.g., SAJ-1204 on the MESICIC, which has a solid structure completely regulated for the assessment of the compliance of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption) or when project teams interviewed were able to describe the next steps of the projects and what would happen one year from now. Activities related to elections management and monitoring also had more likelihood of sustainability because the General Secretariat had significant in-house capability in those areas; many of these activities predated CIDA-2 and were not as dependent as most others on CIDA-2 financing.

Lack of follow-up to training on CSR

In Jamaica, stakeholders interviewed agreed that workshop participants should be encouraged to establish plans for country-level action with clear lines of accountability to ensure sustainable results to workshops and training. A respondent indicated that the OAS needs to be clearer about what is expected from participants once training is completed.
CIDA-2 projects that focused mostly on training and workshop outputs tended to be isolated with no concomitant activities and little follow-up. This model was less conducive to the achievement of sustainable results. Many of the participants attended workshops, which may have been excellent, but with no follow-up it is impossible to determine if the knowledge gained was put to use. This was especially true for workshops that are regional (one or two participants per country) because it is often unrealistic to expect that they will lead to important changes. During country visits, participants consulted noted that there were no expectations for follow-up after the training or the workshop to develop an implementation plan or requirements to do something tangible. When some follow-up was conducted, it was in most cases done informally by General Secretariat staff, and mostly with long-term partners with whom there was an established relationship. (see sidebar)

The evaluation team also found that there was no concerted or central effort to leverage additional resources. Most projects were not designed to fundraise or to continue for a longer term. Although some project teams received contributions from partners other than CIDA (either in-kind or financial), these were not sufficient to ensure long-term changes. Counterpart funding allowed some projects to continue their activities beyond CIDA-2. A total of 15 projects obtained counterpart funding that ranged from 3 per cent of total budget for project SID-1217 to 83 per cent for project CIM-1203. For project SID-1217, the Government of Brazil has provided funding to the Consumer Safety and Health Network Inter-American Rapid Alerts System (CSHN-SIAR) towards the realization of the 2015-2016 workplan.

According to stakeholders interviewed, it is now uncommon to give development assistance to countries in the Americas as most of them have reached middle-income status. It is also tricky for the OAS to ask for contributions from its Member States as it was set up to provide services to Member States. The OAS General Secretariat continues to suffer from a shortage of human and financial resources that would enable it to more effectively and sustainably fulfill its mandates.

Insufficient funding may be one reason for the lack of follow-up, and may also have limited the achievement of immediate and intermediate outcomes. This was evident in project SAJ-1201 where two interviewees pointed out that the newly implemented law on access to public information requires financial and technical capacities from the Salvadorian institute in charge of implementing the law that it currently does not have.

---

**Example of sustainability - SPA-1211**

In Mexico, the Instituto Nacional Electoral (INE) hosted the 8th Inter-American-Electoral Training Seminar in October 2015. This training workshop was initially developed under CIDA-1 and continued to be supported under CIDA-2. However, funds from CIDA-2 were only available until 2014.

DECO had announced that the 2015 Seminar could not be co-sponsored by the OAS as there were no longer CIDA funds available. The INE argued that given the relevance of this seminar and its value for Electoral Management Bodies in the region, it would cover the cost of the seminar. This was a very important step to guarantee the sustainability of the project beyond the CIDA grant. It was also an important indicator that over the years, projects sponsored under the CIDA grant helped to strengthen the capacity of the INE by providing a methodology which the INE has now adopted for its training seminars and will continue to use beyond the CIDA grant.
The review of documents and interviews with stakeholders indicate that sustainability of results is often understood by project teams in terms of use of outputs. For example, some project reports mention that training materials and knowledge generated will continue to be used by the General Secretariat and project participants. Although the use of these outputs is a good start, the evaluation team does not consider these sufficient to demonstrate evidence of sustainability of results. To ensure sustainability, there should first be evidence of immediate or intermediate outcomes achievement and/or tracking and follow-up to ensure that longer-term and sustainable changes occur either to partners or their organizations.

The following are some examples of follow-up or challenges associated with sustainability of results (taken from project reports):

- **Project CIM-1202 (Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belém do Pará Convention):** Follow-up activities include responding to specific requests from States for clarification and additional information, and to continuing to publicize the results of the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round and the specific information products developed on the basis of the first reports using the system of indicators. This does not seem sufficient to ensure sustainability or use of indicators.

- **Project SAJ-1202 (International Commercial Dispute Settlement and Arbitration Related to Trade):** The project report recognizes the difficulty to measure results due to contextual challenges. It also states that making causal linkages between the project and intermediate outcomes is almost impossible.

### Gaps in Sustainability of Projects

In Panama, it is still too early to tell whether the new legal framework on CSR will lead to tangible actions. However, the evaluation team noted the lack of an accountability mechanism to implement the new legal framework and of a monitoring system to measure the extent to which enterprises are adopting practices that are more socially responsible.

In Jamaica, despite increased knowledge of the 2013 secured transaction law imparted as a result of the 2015 OAS workshop, all interviewed stakeholders noted that the law is not yet contributing to increased access to credit for small and medium enterprises for a number of reasons, including lack of capacities among bankers to evaluate movable assets to be used as new collateral items, a lack of trust in the judicial system in the event of credit default, and a risk-averse mentality within the banking system. Continued support and technical assistance is required to address these factors but such support has not been made available either though CIDA-2 funding or other fundraising. Without additional support, the results achieved so far have little likelihood of sustainability.

### Sustainability of networks

- **Project SAJ-1203:** Considerable effort was put into developing a regional resource network in secured transactions reforms. It is difficult to maintain the network in the absence of funding for additional capacity-building and reform activities. The network is not yet strong enough to become self-sustaining without more effort on the part of the General Secretariat.

- **Project SER-1202:** CooperaNet is now embedded in the work of the General Secretariat. While there will be a need to procure funds for specific aspects of the continued development and expansion of partnerships based on emerging needs among member states, it is envisaged that the day-to-day maintenance of the platform will be part of the functions of the General Secretariat.
- **Project SAJ-1201 (Equitable Access to Public Information):** No follow-up activities have been planned and the sustainability of the project’s results depends on the political commitment and legislative momentum in each beneficiary country to complete the legal reform process. Based on these assumptions, sustainability seems very limited.

Sustainability was a concern for many stakeholders consulted during country visits. All stakeholders saw the importance of continuing work on their respective projects, and most mentioned that they will likely keep working on the issues of CIDA-2, albeit with fewer resources and at a slower pace. However, sustainability is highly dependent on follow-up, and none of the persons interviewed could describe substantial follow-up activities by the General Secretariat. This situation was even more problematic for projects which relied on the expertise of external consultants hired by the General Secretariat.

**Finding 21:** CIDA-2 provided more than 20 per cent of the annual budgets of six OAS General Secretariat departments. There were no plans to replace this funding or to sustain the activities it supported when the Cooperation Plan ended.

In its review of budget information on CIDA-2, the evaluation team noted that at least six OAS departments were highly dependent on CIDA-2 to carry out their activities. While CIDA-2 allowed a number of these departments to grow in size and in scope, no long-term planning was done to ensure that this growth would be sustainable. CIDA-2 provided a substantial proportion of funding to the following departments:

- International law – 29.6 per cent of budget during 2012-2015 period
- Summits Secretariat – 25.1 per cent
- Economic & Social Development – 23.9 per cent
- Inter-American Commission of Women – 22.9 per cent
- Effective Public Management – 21.7 per cent
- Planning & Evaluation – 21.5 per cent

The relative dependence of these departments on CIDA-2 funding suggest a lack of in-house capacity in these areas. These numbers, compared to short-term contracts by projects (discussed in Finding 12), show a strong relationship between OAS fields of intervention where there appears to be in-house capacity and others where such capacity is lacking. The work on electoral management bodies and electoral observations is not considerably affected by the end of CIDA-2, while the work of CIM will most likely face several challenges linked to sustainability due to its reliance on CIDA-2 funding and short-term consultants. Sufficient in-house capacity seems closely linked to efficiency in follow-up activities, sustainability and the ability to continue working, even when a major source of funding such as CIDA-2 comes to an end.

General Secretariat “mandates” have been and are approved without allocating the funding necessary to implement them, nor is the technical capacity of the General Secretariat to implement them necessarily taken into consideration. The end of the Cooperation Plan means that the OAS will lose the funding to deliver on some of its many non-funded mandates. Facing these significant budget constraints, discharging political functions will continue to be at the expense of technical cooperation activities.
7 Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

Over the last decades, the Latin America and Caribbean region has changed tremendously. Most countries are now middle-income countries in which private sector development is an important vector of development. Democracy varies greatly in shape and form throughout Latin America and the Caribbean and elected governments struggle against major obstacles such as poverty, inequality and corruption. In this context, the second Cooperation Plan between the OAS and CIDA, which aimed to support electoral management bodies, enhance business environment and access to markets, strengthen gender equality and the OAS, was highly relevant.

At the country level, CIDA-2 responded to needs described in national development plans, although selection of participating countries was generally supply-driven by the General Secretariat headquarters in Washington, DC. This raises questions on whether CIDA-2 projects reach countries that would most benefit from any given project. The evaluation team did not have sufficient data to answer this question. The Cooperation Plan was well aligned with the priorities set out by the Government of Canada in the Americas and also supported specific OAS mandates. However, given the multiple mandates of the OAS and the critical lack of funding of the Organization, CIDA-2 could have put greater emphasis on projects that complemented areas in which the General Secretariat had recognized in-house expertise and capacity. Instead of hiring external consultants with expertise in areas in which the General Secretariat did not have in-house expertise, CIDA-2 projects could have produced more results and be more sustainable had they focused on core areas of the OAS.

CIDA-2 was generally successful in carrying out planned activities and delivering planned outputs. There is clear evidence of the quality and excellent facilitation of workshops and training and of the materials put together for these events. However, as in CIDA-1, most CIDA-2 training interventions were limited to building the skills and knowledge of individuals and did not include follow up activities or plan for organizational results or institutional change. In other areas, CIDA-2 projects contributed to building networks and relationships. Long term partners of the General Secretariat made a positive difference in the achievement of results and follow-up after the completion of activities, while many one-time partners complained about not hearing from the General Secretariat once an activity was completed.

As noted in the evaluation of CIDA-1, the evidence of “immediate” outcome achievement in CIDA-2 remains anecdotal due to lack of monitoring data. It was difficult to achieve or observe expected outcomes given the available resources and short (3-year) timeframe. However, it was also unrealistic to expect to observe outcomes, even “immediate outcomes,” when there were no follow-up activities as an integral part of the project planning/design. Although CIDA-2 developed a performance measurement framework that told part of the story behind the intended theory of change, it did not have an explicit theory of change that articulated clear causal linkages between outputs and outcomes.
and/or that would attribute outcome level results to CIDA-2. It is also likely that the dispersion of 20 relatively small projects across many countries limited outcome achievement and sustainability.

The limited information on CIDA-2’s “immediate” and “intermediate” outcomes precludes a complete analysis of the sustainability of results. Sustainability is a significant concern for most CIDA-2 projects, with most projects unable to show concrete evidence of sustainable results. Many structural elements which would have been required for projects to be sustainable (such as budgeting and technical capacity for follow-up after project completion) did not exist and were never planned. Prospects for sustainability were also seriously compromised by uncertainty over future donor funding to support CIDA-2 related projects. Finally, many projects failed to consider the very short-term nature of CIDA-2 (three years) and the time required to achieve long-term outcomes or institutional, legislative and market changes envisaged by the Cooperation Plan. These design flaws are an important barrier to sustainability.

Institutional strengthening of the OAS, one of the objectives of CIDA-2, focused primarily on results-based management and gender equality. CIDA-2 contributed to the development of OAS staff capacities for gender mainstreaming in all General Secretariat projects. At the project level, however, the integration of the gender perspective in projects was limited to gender-sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data. The evaluation found limited evidence of complete gender analyses in project profiles that indicated how a project intended to benefit women and men differently. While much remains to be done in terms of results-based management, there was noticeable progress in integrating RBM principles throughout the project cycle. A performance measurement framework and logic models were developed with indicators to measure progress. This was a significant improvement over CIDA-1, which did not have a structured way of tracking performance information. There seems to be greater awareness of the importance of RBM throughout the General Secretariat, in part due to implementation of CIDA-2, but the Organization still lacked incentives and senior management commitment to fully integrate RBM in the Secretariat’s activities. The dual nature of the OAS (i.e., political and developmental organization) is a barrier to a full implementation of RBM, particularly in work that is more political in nature. Progress on the integration of RBM will depend to a large extent on the maintenance of the systems and knowledge stemming from CIDA-2 and on senior leadership to use these tools.

The management structure of CIDA-2 was a great improvement on paper compared to CIDA-1. The CIDA-1 evaluation reported coordination problems and management inefficiencies due to the lack of supervision by a single entity. Initially, this void was filled in CIDA-2 by a comprehensive management structure that included a Joint Steering Committee and a Technical Secretariat. This arrangement worked better in terms of coordination, but over time, senior management lost interest in CIDA-2 and the DPE took more of a leadership position. This is of some concern as the DPE is supposed to be a relatively independent body in the General Secretariat.

CIDA-2 had better financial systems than CIDA-1, and provided project teams with real-time financial information. The efficiency of CIDA-2 was negatively affected by the need to hire short-term consultants to carry out work at headquarters, delays in project start-up and disbursements at the onset, and limited use of technologies such as videoconferencing.
7.2 Lesson Learned and Best Practices

The major lessons learned from this evaluation is drawn from multiple sources, including interviews, documents and country visits and is based on the CIDA-2 experience, but would apply to other similar cooperation plans. These lessons include:

- **A cooperation plan between a donor agency and a beneficiary organization will be more relevant, efficient and sustainable if it supports the main areas of expertise of the beneficiary organization.** CIDA-2 would have benefited from increased focus on the General Secretariat’s main areas of expertise. This would have made the cooperation plan more relevant to the Organization as the General Secretariat could have worked on areas where it has in-house technical expertise. This would also have improved efficiency and sustainability, as the General Secretariat would not have had to hire as many short term external consultants, and could have undertaken follow-up activities using its own staff resources. CIDA-2 was designed in large part as a vehicle for the Government of Canada to advance its priorities in the Americas, for instance in terms of economic development and corporate social responsibility, which has been one of Canada’s main priorities for the past years. It did not focus on the OAS core areas of expertise and for this reason, may have led to less effective projects.

- **The measurable success of any intervention depends on how well the design logically links the intended results at each level and on the indicators designed to measure them.** Project profiles were a good addition to CIDA-2, but they were not fully aligned with the other management tools (e.g. reports on progress of project implementation); most importantly, they did not consistently identify assumptions for the achievement of outputs and outcomes, and did not identify risks. The design stage is a critical part of all projects; it takes considerable time and effort to define realistic results at each level and the appropriate indicators to measure those results. When these efforts are made at the onset, project teams have a better understanding of what they have committed to achieve, how they will do it, and how they will measure it.

- **Global Affairs Canada will get better performance from organizations receiving its funding when it carefully selects the appropriate transfer payment mechanism.** The Government of Canada either provides grants or contributions to partner organizations to do international development work. Both mechanisms have very different definitions. While a grant is an unconditional transfer payment where the eligibility criteria are applied before payment, a contribution is a conditional transfer payment in which there are specific performance conditions to be met, including an audit of the recipient’s use of a contribution if necessary26. For additional accountability and control over the work of a recipient organization, a contribution agreement would be advisable. A contribution agreement would allow for a better and more thorough monitoring of results with the right tools. It could also include detailed and specific reporting formats. These considerations have to be well thought through at the design stage and must take into consideration previous work with the organization.

**Turning to Best Practices, the evaluation identified the following:**

- **When beneficiary country selection is based on country priorities, chances of sustainability are increased.** At the design stage, it should be stated very clearly why certain countries are selected

---

and why these countries are the most relevant at a given point in time (e.g., just prior to project launch) to achieve sustainable results. The project profile should include not only a description of the project, but also a clear justification (based on developmental needs of the countries involved and timeliness) to increase the likelihood of achieving planned results. When demands for projects or interventions come from a political level, activities and projects should still be based on country needs to the extent possible.

- **The effectiveness and sustainability of training interventions may be increased when they take a longer term view, plan a phase for participants to use their knowledge, and include regular follow-up with participants and their organizations.** The lack of follow-up and sustainability of results was a major challenge in almost all CIDA-2 training projects reviewed. However, some projects took promising measures to ensure sustainability and these could be replicated or adapted to other countries. In Costa Rica, for example, the Asociación Empresarial para el Desarrollo (AED) offered two rounds of CSR training with the support of CIDA-2. The second round was offered only to those SMEs that had shown evidence of progress with CSR following the first round. In addition, to ensure additional progress, large Costa Rican companies sponsored SMEs who participated in the training. These large companies (referred to as “empresas ancla”) encourage SMEs to make progress on CSR by providing incentives such as better payment terms, or ensuring longer-term relationships. AED also suggested that training participants should pay a small contribution to take part in training sessions which would show their commitment.

- **Engagement and buy-in of senior leadership is critical for institutional change.** In CIDA-2, this was especially true in terms of OAS institutional strengthening and the increased focus on gender and RBM. Without any incentives or firm demand from management or leadership, the culture associated with results-based management or gender equality will not take hold.

### 7.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to the Government of Canada and the General Secretariat of the OAS, and are based on the evaluation framework, the analysis that informed findings and conclusions. Since no future Cooperation Plan is currently planned between the OAS and Global Affairs Canada (GAC), these recommendations are intended to inform both the OAS and the Government of Canada on possible future similar arrangements. Recommendations that are more general are also provided on managerial issues.

**Recommendation to Global Affairs Canada**

**Recommendation 1:** Global Affairs Canada should ensure that any future Cooperation Plans between GAC and the OAS are better anchored in areas where the General Secretariat has substantive knowledge and in-house capacity.

Although it is understandable that donor agencies want to pursue their own interests and priorities through cooperation plans such as CIDA-2, the evaluation team suggests that, within the donor’s priorities, future Cooperation Plans should concentrate on core areas where the General Secretariat or other beneficiary organizations have clear in-house technical capacity. This would ensure that the receiving organization has the capacity to not only design and implement projects, but also to follow-up, which is a crucial aspect in all interventions.
To ensure better alignment with beneficiary organizations, Global Affairs should analyze previous work conducted by these organizations to understand where their strengths and comparative advantages lie, and focus on these areas. With the OAS, for instance, stakeholder perceptions and the analysis of the cost of short-term contracts indicates that the OAS had insufficient in-house expertise in many of the areas that CIDA-2 projects focused on.

This recommendation is linked to Findings 2, 3, 9 and 20.

**Recommendation to the Senior Management of the General Secretariat of the OAS**

**Recommendation 2:** Senior management of the General Secretariat of the OAS should fully discharge its oversight roles and responsibilities in the management of cooperation plans such as CIDA-2.

The Joint Steering Committee did not fully function, at least the final year of CIDA-2. Neither did the Executive Committee. Therefore, it is clear that in the final year of CIDA-2, the General Secretariat did not fulfill its oversight roles and responsibilities in conformity with the Project Management Plan. This had serious effects and resulted in the delegation of management, almost by default, to the evaluation unit, which is supposed to be relatively independent. This was both improper and unfair. For senior managers of the General Secretariat, participation at the Joint Steering Committee meetings is important for demonstrating commitment and seriousness to the CIDA-2 program. Evidence from senior managers of the General Secretariat of "knowing what is going on" could have had important effects on CIDA-2 results.

This recommendation is linked to Findings 17 and 18.

**Strategic Recommendations to the General Secretariat for future cooperation plans**

**Recommendation 3:** In any future cooperation plan, the General Secretariat of the OAS should ensure that project selection, design and implementation are firmly anchored in specific approved OAS mandates and that they are principally in areas where the General Secretariat has in-house capacity and a good track record of technical work and cooperation.

Throughout this evaluation, one serious and well-recognized problem is that the OAS has a significant number of “unfunded mandates” that are approved by the political organs but that the General Secretariat cannot act upon due to lack of funds. Special donor-funded projects and programs such as CIDA-2 often help fund these mandates.

The Secretariat’s project documents typically make reference to OAS mandates, but these tend to be pro forma and usually cite one or more unfunded mandates to justify planned actions. At the same time, CIDA-2’s PMF was weak, especially, but not exclusively, at the outcome level. 27

---

27 An ultimate outcome statement such as “Improved democratic governance and sustainable economic growth in the Americas” in CIDA-2’s PMF tends to undermine the credibility of the PMF.
OAS mandates are approved in the form of resolutions, all of which contain a preamble (“whereas,” “considering,” “taking note of,” etc.) and a “resolves” section. Project design teams should first carefully analyze the text of a given mandate resolution, and develop outcomes and outputs derived directly from either preamble or resolves sections. The “current situation” in project design may be grounded mainly in the preamble section, from which outputs may be identified; the “future desired situation” may be derived from the “resolves” section of a mandate resolution, and could be used to specify outcomes. An analytical mandate-based process of this type could contribute specificity to the PMF for either a single project or a series of interventions, and might also help tighten the content and language of future OAS mandates. 28

This recommendation is linked to Findings 3, 9, 11, 12, 20 and 21.

**Recommendation 4:** In any future cooperation plan, the General Secretariat should ensure that the number of projects and their distribution across countries supports sustainable results and that there are a reasonable number of realistic and achievable outcomes commensurate with the resources available.

In CIDA-2’s scattered approach, multiple projects were approved and implemented in many different countries. Although the General Secretariat faces pressure from Member States to “spread the pie,” a greater effort should be made to plan for more realistic and fewer outputs and outcomes, especially in a cooperation plan such as CIDA-2 that had limited resources and a very short timeframe (i.e., three years).

Sufficient time is required at the design and planning stage to ensure that coherent and realistic choices are made from the onset. The DPE should be involved to provide support in the development of the PMF and individual project logframes. Project teams should be encouraged to prepare project proposals with clear, realistic and measurable results, especially at the outcome level. Senior management should provide leadership when difficult decisions are required or when political influences seek goals that are not appropriate or achievable. In the end, future PMFs should contain fewer outputs and focus on fewer areas of intervention. The components of cooperation plans should also be more commensurate with the amount of resources available.

This recommendation is linked to Findings 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15.

**Recommendation 5:** To increase relevance and sustainability of results, the General Secretariat should ensure that cooperation plan projects are more demand-driven.

This recommendation was also highlighted in the evaluation of CIDA-1. The evaluation of CIDA-2 did not find evidence of mechanisms that would allow Member States or project partners to indicate which CIDA-2-financed projects would be their priorities, or to contribute in the project design phase to ensure that the projects were designed and managed according to their specific needs and contexts. Most CIDA-2 projects were designed in Washington, DC and there was little consultation with countries or proposed beneficiaries prior to developing project profiles.

---

28 As mandates are developed, there is always important interaction between the Member States and the General Secretariat. However, rarely if ever are mandates used intensively and from the beginning to guide the design of projects and programs. If it were common practice to design projects and results frameworks based on mandates, Secretariat staff could eventually have the type of interaction with the delegations of Member States that could lead to greater specificity of the mandates themselves.
One way to do this in the future would be to prepare a list of possible projects to be financed (with a brief description of the idea behind each one) and then consult Member States on: a) their priorities based on the list, b) their specific ideas regarding the types of services that should be provided and the best means to offer those services, and c) their willingness to be consulted in the project design phase.

This recommendation is linked to Findings 1, 3, 11, 16 and 20.

**Operational Recommendations to the General Secretariat**

**Recommendation 6:** The General Secretariat should ensure that project teams plan better for capacity building activities and allocate resources for follow-up activities.

This recommendation was also highlighted in the evaluation of CIDA-1, which noted that “Follow-up activities should be incorporated in every capacity building activity conducted by the General Secretariat.” The CIDA-2 evaluation team cannot emphasize enough how important this is for sustainable results. The evaluation found that almost no follow-up activities had been planned and that budgeting for follow-up was either non-existent or insufficient. Follow-up activities that are required to achieve the next level of results, in this case outcomes, should be included in the design of outputs. This constitutes a major issue for the General Secretariat as it is unable to demonstrate or support the achievement or sustainability of results. Without proper planning and budgeting, chances that appropriate follow-up will be carried out on a systematic basis are slim.

In their project profiles and planning documents, project teams should be required to identify the methods they will use to ensure follow-up once the initial activities are completed – to increase the likelihood that methods, recommendations, model laws, etc. are put to use by the beneficiaries, to understand what worked or did not work, and whether or not there is or will be progress towards longer-term results. Follow-up activities have to be carefully budgeted as they require time and resources. The support of the DPE will be essential to ensure that project teams fully integrate follow-up in their project designs. Implementation of this recommendation will likely depend on the extent to which future projects are based on in-house capacity.

This recommendation is linked to Findings 4, 5, 9, 11, and 20.

**Recommendation 7:** The General Secretariat should be more transparent in countries where it implements projects and share more information on its projects with national representatives.

During country visits, the evaluation team noted that there was very little knowledge of CIDA-2 and its projects. This was true not only for OAS Country Office staff, but also for partners from technical cooperation agencies. OAS Country Office representatives were expected to take part in certain activities or represent the OAS during CIDA-2 events, yet most had little or no knowledge about it. Additional communication would seem desirable, in particular since OAS Country Office staff have on-the-ground knowledge of local context and actors, as well as contacts that could be beneficial to project teams based in Washington.

In addition, national technical cooperation agencies representatives had no knowledge about CIDA-2 or the development work carried out by the OAS in general. As a signatory to the Paris Declaration, the OAS has the obligation to harmonize and align its work with that of other donors. The registration of OAS projects with national technical cooperation agencies is often required by law and could become a source of information on needs or potential synergies. To the extent possible, the General Secretariat
should make greater efforts to ensure that its work is disseminated and known by country officials and should take advantage of OAS Country Offices staff knowledge.

This recommendation is linked to Finding 19.

**Recommendation 8:** The General Secretariat should ensure that gender integration is mainstreamed in all projects and cascade down projects and be obvious in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Other than having disaggregated data by gender on results and indicators, there is little evidence of gender-related efforts in project design or analysis. At the moment, there are little resources available at the OAS to focus on additional gender mainstreaming, but over time, the overall gender approach of the General Secretariat to programming should be deepened.

This recommendation is linked to Finding 6.

**Recommendation 9:** Specific guidance and protocols for harmonization and/or standardization of OAS websites should be developed and implemented, and periodic reports on the usage of websites should be produced in order to determine if demand is sufficient to maintain and update them.

Before embarking on building new websites or web pages for individual projects, the General Secretariat should first, obtain detailed (monthly) reports for each of the websites financed under CIDA-1 and CIDA-2 to determine usage. On that basis, the General Secretariat should justify any additional donor-financed websites to be developed in the future.

This recommendation is linked to Finding 13.

**Recommendation 10:** Since much of its work (and certainly donor-funded initiatives) is directed toward technical cooperation, the General Secretariat should continue to strengthen its use and commitment to results-based management by extending it to non-donor funded activities and projects. In implementing this recommendation, it might consider assessing its performance in the management of development cooperation as a means of identifying areas that should be strengthened and obtaining specific suggestions for strengthening RBM in those areas. Modernization and standardization of the General Secretariat’s financial systems – including those implemented for donor-funded activities – should be an integral component of this process.

Many international organizations (e.g., UN agencies, multilateral banks) have commissioned independent organizational assessments of their organizations to help them improve their performance. Such an assessment could help the OAS and its Member States identify specific strengths as well as gaps in OAS strategic management, operational management, relationship management, and knowledge management and where and how the General Secretariat could improve its overall performance through extending the use of RBM to all budgeted activities and areas.

This recommendation is linked to Findings 8 and 14.

---

29 See for example the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network: [www.mopanonline.org](http://www.mopanonline.org)
Appendix I  Terms of Reference


1. JUSTIFICATION AND OBJECTIVES

1.1. The purpose of this consultancy is to evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2012 -2015. The evaluation will specifically focus on the delivery of: i) the main Outputs, and the Immediate and Intermediate Outcomes for all the projects; and iii) contribution to the Ultimate Outcome of the Plan consigned in the Logic Model and the Performance Measurement Framework approved by CIDA and the General Secretariat of the OAS

1.2. To achieve the objective the Consultant shall:

- Conduct a summative evaluation in order to identify the main results of the Plan and its projects.
- Determine the relevance of the Plan and its projects vis a vis the OAS mandates and priorities in the countries benefited by the Plan.
- Determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan and its projects.
- Critically analyze the formulation, design, implementation and management of the Plan and its Projects and make recommendations as needed.
- Assess the institutional and financial sustainability of the interventions financed by the Plan.
- Document lessons learned related to the formulation, design, implementation, management and sustainability.
- Make recommendations, as appropriate, to improve the formulation, design and implementation of similar interventions.
- Assess if and how the Plan and its projects addressed the crosscutting issue of gender perspective and to what results.

1.3. In addition to the above, the consultancy will make every attempt to answer the following performance questions:

- Was the Plan’s Theory of Change effective?
- Were Plan and project objectives achievable and are they sustainable?
- Were Plan and project objectives achieved?
- Did the Plan applied results based management principles from its inception to its conclusion?
- Are indicators for the projects financed in the Plan S.M.A.R.T.?
- Were the outcome indicators the appropriate measurement of success?
- Was the process for the selection of projects under the Plan effective considering the criteria used?
- Did the new Plan give priority to what were identified as successful lines of action in the first cooperation plan?
- Did projects include specific requirements for conducting follow-up of training activities in order to measure: increased skills, awareness and abilities among recipients; and the strengthening of institutions where such individuals work, among others?
Where protocols developed and/or standardized to harmonize the diverse number of websites and collaborative networks created as a result of project interventions?
Were the targeting criteria defined and used in the projects for the selection of beneficiaries? And was it the appropriate criteria?
Was the monitoring mechanism used an efficient and effective tool to follow-up on the projects?

2. ACTIVITIES

2.1. This consultancy will be coordinated and supervised by the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE).

2.2. The evaluation process will take a participatory approach and take account of the views of all key stakeholders. In general the evaluation will be based on interviews, analysis of documents, field visits, use of relevant evaluation instruments (i.e. application of surveys, focus groups, etc.) and all available data sources, as required.

2.3. To achieve the objectives of the Terms of Reference, the consultancy shall:

Conduct an inception mission to OAS headquarters to meet with key stakeholders and assess more accurately the scope of the work and request the necessary information to perform effectively. As a result of the inception mission the consulting firm will update and submit a second version of the work plan to the DPE, the work plan will include the description and chronology of the activities to be carried out, the reports to be submitted and the deliverables of the evaluation.

Develop an Evaluation Framework (EF) which will contribute to determine if the Plan and the projects were implemented efficiently and effectively and generated the expected results. The EF shall include the following sections among other, a description of the methodology of the evaluation; a sample framework; a plan for data collection and analysis of the information; the instruments to be used for data collection and the calendar for data collection, an analysis of the information and production and delivery of reports; and a draft proposal of the table of contents of the final evaluation report. The evaluation shall use quantitative as well as qualitative methodologies.

Develop a sample framework as part of the evaluation framework considering selection criteria that best fits the needs of the information required to assess the Plan. Among those criteria the consultancy will include projects that have received funds in the first and the current cooperation plans as well as those that have supported collaborative networks. Other criteria should favor the representativeness of OAS supported sectors and geographical regions. During the inception mission the consultancy, in conjunction with the DPE and key stakeholders, will finalize the selection criteria to be used for the in-depth analysis of selected projects.

Validate the chain of results (Logic Model) for the Plan and projects, by determining if it was adequate and valid for the expected and actual results.

Assess the management of the Plan and projects in the use of planning and implementation tools.

Assess the technical and economic feasibility of the program, including the sustainability of its benefits.

Determine the relevance of the criteria used for the targeting of beneficiaries; including member countries benefiting from the projects and make appropriate recommendations for similar projects in the future.

Analyze how and if the projects incorporated a gender perspective approach in the execution of its components, and if there were any such efforts determine how consequential it was.
Review all the relevant documentation needed, including those mentioned in paragraph 2.2 and others such as: documents related to the Plan and project formulation, including: the Logic Model for both cooperation plans; the performance measurements frameworks; the project profiles; the progress reports and any means of verification of the outputs and outcomes, among others.

Conduct interviews and collect information from key stakeholders, including: program teams (in Washington DC) and program beneficiaries.

Measure the Plan and projects’ performance in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. The consultancy shall review and suggest adjustments to the indicators identified in the cooperation plan. In addition, the consultancy shall identify propose and measure indicators that were not considered in the design. The consultancy shall analyze the extent to which the expected results were achieved as well as identify unplanned results that may have occurred.

Determine if, and describe how the recommendations and lessons learned issued as a result of the evaluation of the first OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 were implemented. In particular, the consultancy will pay special attention to the recommendations and lessons learned of those projects that received financing under both cooperation plans, 2008-11 and 2012-15.

Produce a midterm and a final report describing the execution, outputs and outcomes of the supported actions; lessons learned, recommendations and conclusions; a section for sustainability, institutional strengthening and beneficiaries, among others. Both reports will be accompanied by a Power Point presentation.

Conduct at least 8 missions to Member Countries as needed. The selection criteria for the countries to be visited will be determined during the inception mission in conjunction with the DPE and key stakeholders.

3. OUTPUTS, DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

3.1. The consultancy should generate the following documents taking into consideration each of the activities described in the above section:

- A detailed work plan and the evaluation Framework within a week of finalizing the inception mission.
- A midterm report on the progress of the consultancy upon reaching 50% of the approved consultancy time period, including a Power Point to be presented in OAS headquarters on a previously agreed date.
- Final Evaluation Report including Power Point Presentation to be presented in OAS headquarters on a previously agreed date.

3.2. The consultancy will have the following payment schedule and perform the following deliveries:

i) 15% upon the signing of the contract.
ii) 20% Upon delivery of a detailed Work Plan and Evaluation Framework
iii) 30% Upon delivery of a midterm report accompanied by a Power Point presentation.
iv) 35% Upon delivery of the Final Evaluation Report accompanied by a Power Point presentation.
4. QUALIFICATIONS AND SELECTION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

4.1. The evaluation team must be comprised of at least 4 members, and each one of them must demonstrate a minimum 10 years’ of expertise in at least one of the following areas: program and project evaluation; institutional strengthening; and gender. Team members should also have attained a graduate degree in public policy, economics, management or related area; and experience working in Latin America and the Caribbean. In addition, the team should be proficient in the use of the Spanish and English language. Experience working with an international organization in the Americas and in the evaluation of similar cooperation plans is a plus.

5. PROCUREMENT PROCESS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

5.1. The selection process will follow the procurement policies and procedures contained in the various policy documents of the GS/OAS, thus ensuring the application of the principles of competitiveness and transparency with the ultimate goal of awarding the contract to the firm with more merit. The method to be used to evaluate proposals will be the Quality- and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS). QCBS uses a competitive process among participants, which takes into account the quality of the proposal and the cost of services. The quality and cost will account for 90% and 10%, respectively, of the final score.

5.2. The Department of Planning and Evaluation will put together a team of at least four members to assess the technical proposals submitted for the consideration of the Contract and Awards Committee Members of the General Secretariat of the OAS. The team will assess the following criteria:

Specific experience of the team pertinent to the tasks within the TORs;
Methodology and work plan proposed in response to the terms of reference, including:
   a) Technical approach and methodology,
   b) Work Plan, and
   c) Organization and staffing

Qualifications of key consultants and work competency, considering the following sub-criteria: a) General qualifications, b) work competency, c) experience in the region and d) oral and written knowledge of Spanish and English language.

6. DURATION

Duration: It is expected that the consultancy will require a total of 5 months starting September 15, 2015 and finishing February 15, 2016. The consulting team shall plan to spend the necessary time in Washington to efficiently and effectively execute the above described activities.
# Appendix II  Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FOCI</th>
<th>SUB-FOCI</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROXY INDICATOR</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Congruence with OAS mandate</td>
<td>• To what extent did the <strong>immediate and intermediate outcomes</strong> identified in the Cooperation Plan support the OAS mandate?</td>
<td>• Degree of alignment of the five outcome areas with OAS mandate  &lt;br&gt; • Evidence that the Cooperation Plan is a good vehicle to achieve OAS mandate  &lt;br&gt; • Perception from stakeholders on degree of alignment</td>
<td>Document review – references from project documents to which mandate projects contributed to  &lt;br&gt; Interviews  &lt;br&gt; Country visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congruence with Member States’ priorities and beneficiaries’ priorities</td>
<td>• To what extent did the Cooperation Plan respond to the needs and priorities of OAS member states?</td>
<td>• Perception of stakeholders on alignment with needs and priorities of member states  &lt;br&gt; • Level of satisfaction of stakeholders in benefiting countries  &lt;br&gt; • Alignment of country strategies with the Cooperation Plan</td>
<td>Document review (countries National plans)  &lt;br&gt; Interviews  &lt;br&gt; Country visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congruence with DFATD priorities(^{30}) in Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>• To what extent are the objectives of the Cooperation Plan consistent with the Government of Canada’s priorities in Latin America and the Caribbean, namely increasing Canadian and hemispheric economic opportunity, addressing democracy, and fostering lasting relationships?</td>
<td>• Degree of Contribution of CIDA-2 outcomes to the DFATD priorities for LAC  &lt;br&gt; • Perception of respondents (OAS, DFATD, Member States)</td>
<td>Document review  &lt;br&gt; Interviews  &lt;br&gt; Country visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FOCI</th>
<th>SUB-FOCI</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROXY INDICATOR</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Effectiveness    | OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2012-2015    | • To what extent were the results at the output and outcome levels of the Cooperation Plan achieved?  
• To what extent did individual projects made contribution to their immediate outcomes?  
• Were there unintended results?  
• What factors enabled or limited achievement of results?  
• What are the key characteristics of most performing projects? | • Number of projects that achieved immediate outcomes  
• Number of projects that achieved all their outputs  
• Comparison between actual versus planned results  
• Factors affecting the achievement of results | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
| Integration of gender perspective | How effectively was the cross-cutting issue of gender integrated to the Cooperation Plan and corresponding projects?  
To what extent has the Cooperation Plan supported the development of a gender sensitive culture within the OAS and the General Secretariat? | • Number of projects that included a gender dimension  
• Evidence of integration of gender considerations in documentation that relates to the Cooperation Plan  
• Level of support from leadership in integrating gender considerations to the work of the organization  
• Evidence of availability of gender-disaggregated data | Document review  
(gender review notes & comments)  
Interviews  
Country visits |
| Integration of RBM principles | To what extent did the Cooperation Plan apply results-based management principles beginning with project design and throughout the project cycle?  
To what extent has the Cooperation Plan supported the development of a management for results culture within the General Secretariat?  
To what extent are indicators for the projects financed in the Plan S.M.A.R.T.?  
To what extent were the outcome indicators specified in the results framework the appropriate measurement of success? | • Number of OAS projects that are managed by results throughout the project cycle  
• Evidence of a program design managed by results throughout the program cycle (CIDA-2 design, implementation, reporting, etc.)  
• Evidence of use of RBM approach throughout the cycles of OAS project other than CIDA-2 (donor supported and OAS supported) | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FOCI</th>
<th>SUB-FOCI</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROXY INDICATOR</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Efficiency     | Appropriate formulation & design of the Cooperation Plan | - What is the Cooperation Plan Theory of Change and to what extent was it effective?  
- To what extent were the Cooperation Plan objectives achievable?  
- To what extent was the process for the selection of projects under the Cooperation Plan effective considering the criteria used?  
- Did the new Cooperation Plan give priority to what were identified as successful lines of action in the first Cooperation Plan?  
- Were the targeting criteria defined and used in the projects for the selection of beneficiaries? And were they the appropriate criteria? | - Evidence that the Cooperation Plan was guided by a clear Theory of Change  
- Evidence of appropriate logic behind the Cooperation Plan outputs and outcomes  
- Adequacy of criteria used for the selection of projects  
- Evidence of projects selected based on lessons from the previous Cooperation Plan  
- Adequacy of criteria for the selection of beneficiaries | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
| Implementation & management of the Cooperation Plan (governance, communication, etc.) | - To what extent were roles and responsibilities of the different governance bodies clearly articulated? What was the degree of compliance with these roles?  
- Were protocols developed and/or standardized to harmonize the diverse number of websites and collaborative networks created as a result of project interventions?  
- Have the processes for communications, problem-solving, coordination, and decision-making related to the Cooperation Plan worked efficiently? | - Number of protocols developed to harmonize similar initiatives  
- Perceptions on usefulness of assistance provided by the technical secretariat  
- Adequacy and usefulness of the governance structure  
- Adequacy of communication strategy  
- Adequacy of resource utilization | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FOCI</th>
<th>SUB-FOCI</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROXY INDICATOR</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monitoring and evaluation of the Cooperation Plan | • To what extent did the Cooperation Plan use its resources (people, time, money) efficiently to achieve its objectives?  
• To what extent have the Cooperation Plan outputs been achieved on time?  
• To what extent was the Cooperation Plan administered in a cost-effective manner in view of its objectives?  
• To what extent has there been improvements in the management practices of the general Secretariat as a results of the CP?  
• What are the reasons that can explain budget reallocations and other modifications to activities?  
• To what extent did the Cooperation Plan applied the clauses of its grant agreement (including the French language clause)? | • Number or percentage of Projects whose processes were completed as planned, and within time  
• Extent to which the Cooperation Plan transaction costs are deemed acceptable by stakeholders  
• Clarity and adequacy of roles and responsibilities as expressed in MOU  
• Degree of application of the grant agreement clauses | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
| Sustainability | Institutional sustainability | • What specific implicit and explicit requirements for conducting follow-up of activities existed to measure: increased skills, awareness and abilities among recipients; and the strengthening of institutions where such individuals work, among others?  
• To what extent was the monitoring mechanism used an efficient and effective tool to follow-up on the projects?  
• To what extent was the monitoring system used to make adjustments to how the investments were delivered. | • Evidence of specific guidance or requirements to monitor progress  
• Extent to which existing mechanisms were used  
• Number of projects that complied with the monitoring mechanisms  
• Quality of project monitoring reports  
• Nature and frequency of report on the overall Cooperation Plan | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FOCI</th>
<th>SUB-FOCI</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROXY INDICATOR</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Financial sustainability** | • To what extent are the Cooperation Plan interventions financially sustainable after the plan has concluded? | • Availability of financial resources to sustain activities beyond the Cooperation Plan  
• Evidence of leveraging of resources from other donors/member states or diversification of funding | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
| **Sustainability of results** | • To what extent are the results of the Cooperation Plan likely to be sustained over time?  
• To what extent are there strategies in place to encourage and support continued results sustainability?  
• What would be required to increase the likelihood of results sustainability? | • Availability of OAS staff to continue the work on projects  
• Existence of proven long term mechanism in place to sustain products and services  
• Evidence of strategies to support sustainability | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
| **Lessons learned** | • What are the main lessons learned on formulation, design, implementation, management and sustainability of the Cooperation Plan?  
• What are the plans that have been put in place by the OAS to address the lessons learned?  
• To what extent were the recommendations and lessons learned from CIDA-1 implemented and/or taken into consideration in the design and implementation of CIDA-2? | • Key lessons learned as identified by stakeholders  
• Availability of management response on previous evaluation  
• Implementation of recommendations | Document review  
Interviews  
Country visits |
## Appendix III  Stakeholders Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre Guimond</td>
<td>Inter-American Regional Program, Global</td>
<td>Affairs Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret A. Maitland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian Embassy in Washington D.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte McDowell</td>
<td>Alternate Representative</td>
<td>Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costa Rica</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josué Arguedas</td>
<td>Executive, Comprehensive management for</td>
<td>Asociación Empresarial para el Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand-Xavier Asselin</td>
<td>Political counselor</td>
<td>Embassy of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Castillo Vargas</td>
<td>Executive Director, National Commission for</td>
<td>Supreme Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Improvement of the Administration of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kattia Chaves Matarrita</td>
<td>Chief, Department of Political and Market</td>
<td>Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Comercio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ève Giguère</td>
<td>Commercial Counselor and Senior Trade</td>
<td>Embassy of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Hidalgo</td>
<td>Coordinator, Area of Gender Violence</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Fernanda Pérez</td>
<td>Director, Economic Sector</td>
<td>Asociación Empresaria para el Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaquín Picado</td>
<td>Attorney and Specialist in Commercial Law</td>
<td>Picado &amp; Leon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskia Rodriguez Steichen</td>
<td>Director, International Cooperation Sector</td>
<td>Ministerio de Planificación Nacional y Política Económica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Solis Zelaya</td>
<td>Magistrate</td>
<td>Supreme Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominican Republic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamile Adames</td>
<td>Political and Communications Officer</td>
<td>Embassy of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araceli Azuara</td>
<td>Directora</td>
<td>Oficina de la OEA en Republica Dominicana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael Alberto Basora</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dirección General de Ética e Integridad Gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Díaz Amberis</td>
<td>Director Técnico, Gestión de Calidad</td>
<td>Junta Central Electoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramonita García</td>
<td>Vice Ministra</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Ogando</td>
<td>Técnica Administrativa</td>
<td>Oficina de la OEA en Republica Dominicana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaquín Alberto Ramírez</td>
<td>Subdirector General</td>
<td>Dirección General de Cooperación Multilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Salvador</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dra. Diana Burgos</td>
<td>Jefa de Calidad</td>
<td>Defensoria del Consumidor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Mauricio Campos</td>
<td>Comisionado</td>
<td>Instituto de Acceso a la Información Publica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héctor Córdova</td>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>FEDECACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Cornejo</td>
<td>Colaborador Jurídico</td>
<td>Ministerio de Economía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herminia Funes</td>
<td>Comisionada</td>
<td>Instituto de Acceso a la Información Publica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Víctor Iraheta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dirección General de Transformación del Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliana Monteiro</td>
<td>Coordinadora de Cooperación Internacional</td>
<td>CENTROMYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronalth Ivan Ochaeta Argueta</td>
<td>Representante</td>
<td>Oficina OEA en el Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Adolfo Ortega</td>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>Instituto de Acceso a la Información Publica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denisse Ortez</td>
<td>Coordinadora de Gestión por Procesos</td>
<td>Dirección General de Transformación del Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Palma</td>
<td>Directora</td>
<td>Cámara Salvadoreña de Tecnología y Comunicación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illich Orlando Quinteros Moya</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Registro de Garantías Mobiliarias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Rafael Guerrero</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Registro de Comercio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Rios Pineda</td>
<td>Gerente de Asuntos Jurídicos</td>
<td>Ministerio de Economía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileana Rogel</td>
<td>Directora Executiva</td>
<td>CONAMYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberto Sáenz Marinero</td>
<td>Founding Partner</td>
<td>Sáenz and Asociados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Figueroa Santamaria</td>
<td>Directora Ejecutiva</td>
<td>CENTROMYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauricio Vásquez López</td>
<td>Comisionado</td>
<td>Instituto de Acceso a la Información Publica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Elizabeth Villalta Vizcarra</td>
<td>Directora General</td>
<td>Adjunta de Soberanía e Integridad Territorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jamaica</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Andrade</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>Goffe Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janent Blackwood</td>
<td>Legal Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Water, Land, environment and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliana Blacke</td>
<td>Director, MSME Development</td>
<td>Ministry of Industry, Investment and Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmin Chong</td>
<td>Trade Commissioner/Senior Business Development Officer</td>
<td>Canadian Embassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrene Collings</td>
<td>International Trade Specialist</td>
<td>Ministry of Industry, Investment and Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orette Fisher</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Electoral Commission of Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Foster-Pusey</td>
<td>Solicitor General</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Goffe</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>Jamaica Intellectual Property Office (JIPO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Grant</td>
<td>Senior Parliamentary Counsel</td>
<td>Office of the Parliamentary Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hawkins</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Atlantic Risk Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheron Henry</td>
<td>General Manager, Legal Services</td>
<td>Development Bank of Jamaica Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Henry</td>
<td>Vice President of Governmental Affairs</td>
<td>The Bank of Nova Scotia Jamaica Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Johnson</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Johnson’s Organic Fertilizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Malcolm</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Chartered Institute of Arbitrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleta Mattis</td>
<td>Head of Legal Unit</td>
<td>University of the West Indies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Ramlogan</td>
<td>Chief Executive Office and Registrar of Companies</td>
<td>Companies Office of Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Staw</td>
<td>Manager, Special Projects</td>
<td>Jamaica Promotions Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Sutherland-Reid</td>
<td>Senior Legal Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Industry, Investment and Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanelle Van GlaanenWeygel</td>
<td>OAS Representative</td>
<td>OAS Office in Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Wade</td>
<td>Senior Project Economist</td>
<td>External Cooperation Management Division, Multilateral Technical Cooperation Unit, Planning Institute of Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athea West-Myers</td>
<td>Manager, Business Advisory services</td>
<td>Jamaican Business Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexico</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Carillo Poblano</td>
<td>Director, International relations</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional Electoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Castro</td>
<td>Trade Commissioner Assistant</td>
<td>Canadian Embassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalba Cruz Jiménez</td>
<td>Trade Commissioner</td>
<td>Canadian Embassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela Eternod Aramburu</td>
<td>Executive secretary</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaquin J. González Casanova</td>
<td>Director General for Access to Information</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de Acceso a la Información</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro González Hernández</td>
<td>General Coordinator of Strategic Planning, Evaluation and Safety</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional del Emprendedor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauricio Guerrero Gomez</td>
<td>Director general for international organizations and multilateral cooperation</td>
<td>Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braulio Laveaga</td>
<td>Director general</td>
<td>American Chamber, Guadalajara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Gabriel Morales Morales</td>
<td>Deputy Director general for hemispheric and security affairs</td>
<td>Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aníbal Quiñónez Abarca</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flor de Lis Vásquez Muñoz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria del Rosario Vásquez Rosales</td>
<td>International Affairs Director for Access to Information</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de Acceso a la Información</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Cruz Fano</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Urizar</td>
<td>Head of the Electoral Observation Section</td>
<td>Department of Electoral Cooperation and Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatriz Piñeres</td>
<td>Specialist/SIRG Coordinator</td>
<td>Department of Electoral Cooperation and Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Pognat</td>
<td>Chief of Section, Relations with Civil Society</td>
<td>Department of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Parga</td>
<td>Chief of Section (Competitiveness, innovation and technology)</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia S. de Windt</td>
<td>Chief, Environmental Law, Policy and Good Governance Section</td>
<td>Department of Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Goolsarran</td>
<td>Project Management Specialist</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Yrivarren</td>
<td>Financial Reporting Manager</td>
<td>Department of Financial and Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Tangarife</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith John</td>
<td>Consultant, tourism</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardo de Icaza</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Electoral Cooperation and Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Arduz</td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Anderson</td>
<td>Senior Gender Specialist</td>
<td>Inter-American Commission on Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Niewola</td>
<td>CSR Consultant</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Moreno-Valle</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Department of International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lambert</td>
<td>Secretary for Hemispheric Affairs</td>
<td>Secretariat for Hemispheric Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Thery</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Arnaiz</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of financial and Administrative Management Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Tramhela</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Financial and Administrative Management Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Espino Mitchel</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
<td>Department of Financial and Administrative Management Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Osborne</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Executive Secretariat for Integral Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Martinez</td>
<td>Senior Legal Officer</td>
<td>Department of Legal Cooperation, Secretariat for Legal Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Porto</td>
<td>Senior Advisor for Strategy and Organizational Development</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magaly McLean</td>
<td>Senior Legal Officer</td>
<td>Department of International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Fernanda Trigo</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department for Effective Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria T. Mellenkamp</td>
<td>Chief, Electoral Technical Cooperation Section</td>
<td>Department of Electoral Cooperation and Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria de los Milagros Freyre</td>
<td>Senior Specialist</td>
<td>Department for Effective Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Vidaurri</td>
<td>Chief Political Analysis</td>
<td>Department of Sustainable Democracy and Special Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana Herrera</td>
<td>Project Management Specialist</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Hueneke</td>
<td>Chief of Section, Relations with Permanent Observers</td>
<td>Department of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryse Robert</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Gomez</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Department of Economic and Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Andrade</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Summits of the Americas Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Dominguez</td>
<td>Representative in Uruguay</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cambpell</td>
<td>Chief of Section (Culture and Tourism)</td>
<td>Department of Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Noguera</td>
<td>Chief of DECO’s Electoral Studies and Projects Section</td>
<td>Department of Electoral Cooperation and Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastien Sigouin</td>
<td>Counselor, Alternate Representative</td>
<td>Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Wetter</td>
<td>Officer (Trade and Economic development)</td>
<td>Department of Economic and Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacsure Cutler</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeruti Mendez</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Department of Electoral Cooperation and Observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panama**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teresita Chávez</td>
<td>Policy Analyst</td>
<td>Embassy of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa de Alfaro</td>
<td>Directora Ejecutiva</td>
<td>SUMARSE – Red del Pacto Global en Panamá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagmar de Alvarez</td>
<td>Immediate past president</td>
<td>APEDE &amp; Red del Pacto Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth M. de Rivas</td>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
<td>OAS Office in Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Franco</td>
<td>Coordinadora de Planes y Programas</td>
<td>Secretaría Nacional de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoila Guerra de Castillo</td>
<td>Directora, Gestión y Transferencia de Conocimiento</td>
<td>Universidad Tecnológica de Panamá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Lam</td>
<td>Jefe, Cooperación Técnica Internacional</td>
<td>Autoridad Nacional de Transparencia y Acceso a la Información (ANTAI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liriola Leoteau de Avila</td>
<td>Directora General</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de la Mujer (INAMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla Maloney</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Panama Canada Chamber of Commerce - PANCANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Morán</td>
<td>Asistente de la Ministra</td>
<td>Autoridad de la Pequeña y Mediana Empresa (AMPYME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileana Pineda</td>
<td>CSR Manager</td>
<td>Cervecería Barú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulina Rodríguez Werner</td>
<td>Gerente General</td>
<td>Pizzolante (consultants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesly Salmerón</td>
<td>Analista</td>
<td>Secretaría de Competitividad y Logística</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suguey Serrano</td>
<td>Analista</td>
<td>Secretaría de Competitividad y Logística</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paraguay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloria de Arriola</td>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
<td>OAS Office in Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Benítez</td>
<td>Directora General de Planificación</td>
<td>Secretaría de la Función Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariela Cazal</td>
<td>Abogada</td>
<td>Fiscalía General del Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federico Espinoza</td>
<td>Fiscal Adjunto Anti-corrupción</td>
<td>Fiscalía General del Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Marchuk Chena</td>
<td>Abogada</td>
<td>Fiscalía General del Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Paz Bustamante</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>OAS Office in Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Pavón</td>
<td>Directora, Políticas de Prevención de Violencia de Género</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberto R. Peralta Beaufort</td>
<td>Secretario Ejecutivo</td>
<td>Secretaría de la Función Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estela Sánchez Dávalos</td>
<td>Viceministra de Protección de Derechos de la Mujer</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graciela Zelaya</td>
<td>Directora General, Violencia de Género</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Pavón</td>
<td>Directora, Políticas de Prevención de Violencia de Género</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberto R. Peralta Beaufort</td>
<td>Secretario Ejecutivo</td>
<td>Secretaría de la Función Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estela Sánchez Dávalos</td>
<td>Viceministra de Protección de Derechos de la Mujer</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graciela Zelaya</td>
<td>Directora General, Violencia de Género</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peru**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martha Inés Aldana Durán</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annick Amyot</td>
<td>Director of Development Cooperation</td>
<td>Embassy of Canada in Lima, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Gómez Del Corzo</td>
<td>Commercial Agreements Coordinator</td>
<td>Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo (MINCETUR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirbel Alberto Epiquién Rivera</td>
<td>General Director</td>
<td>Dirección General de Gestión Sostenible del Patrimonio Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre, Servicio Nacional Forestal y de Fauna Silveste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Galindo Alcántara</td>
<td>Sub-director of Corporate Relations</td>
<td>Oficina Nacional de Progreso Electorales (ONPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa María López Triveño</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Jurado Nacional de Elecciones (JNE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willmer Molina</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Capacity building</td>
<td>Superintendencia nacional de los registros públicos (SUNARP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Isabel Moscol</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>OAS Country Office in Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Sotello</td>
<td>Independent Consultant in Corporate, Banking and Financial Law</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>César Uyeyama Shibata</td>
<td>Legal Advisor</td>
<td>Consejo Nacional de la Competitividad (CNC), Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Vásquez Vela</td>
<td>Deputy Minister</td>
<td>Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo (MINCETUR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV  Interview Protocols

Interview Protocols

Introduction: introduce interviewer(s); explain purpose of the evaluation and of the interview; ensure confidentiality of responses, ask if interviewee has any questions.

Evaluation Background and Purpose: In October 2015, the General Secretariat of the OAS contracted Universalia Management Group (based in Montreal) to carry out the final evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2012-2015. The purpose of this consultancy, as described in the TORs, is to evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2012-2015. The evaluation focuses on the delivery of the main outputs and “immediate” and intermediate outcomes for all projects of the Cooperation Plan. Universalia carried out the evaluation of the previous OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan.

This interview: As part of the evaluation we conduct various types of data collection, including seven in-country and three virtual country site visits – including the one in relation to your country. As part of these site visits we consult with a variety of stakeholders, in particular OAS representatives, donors, partners and beneficiaries. Please note that all interviews are confidential, i.e., we only use information in aggregated format in our report, and make sure that direct quotes cannot be traced back to interviewed individuals.

Kindly note that this will be a semi-structured interview; the questions of this protocol may be adapted based on your role and responsibilities.

Before we begin, do you have any questions or concerns about the evaluation or this interview?
Partners

These can be other donors as well (either financial or in-kind).

Interview questions should be based on specific projects. Prior to the interview, review the specific project the partner has been involved in and make sure that questions are asked in relation that project.

**Introduction/Background**

1) What is your current position, and since when have you held it?
2) In what ways, and since when, have you been aware of or engaged in this OAS/CIDA project?

**Country Context**

3) What are the key things that we need to know about your country/agency that may affect the results or implementation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan? (e.g. political, economic, donor landscape, etc.) *(Please think of this specific project)*

**Relevance**

4) How did the OAS/CIDA project respond to needs and priorities of your country? *(Probe: Is this area specifically mentioned in the national plan?)*

**Effectiveness**

5) Why did you (or your organization) decide to participated in or support this particular project?
6) From your point of view, what have been the key achievements of the project in your country? *(Probe: What specifically is expected to happen in your country, in relation to the project, over the next 12-18 months?)*
7) How would you explain the project’s successes and missed opportunities? What has worked well? What hasn’t? What have been the key factors that have supported or hindered success?
8) Which activities of the project have been the most and the least useful/successful? Why?
9) What is your opinion as to the strengths and weaknesses of this specific project? *(Specify which project you are referring to)*
10) Are you aware of any unintended results? Please describe.

**Efficiency**

11) What comments do you have regarding the project’s efficiency? (Could you have accomplished the results (especially outputs) with lower budget/less time?)
12) To what extent were the project resources adequate to achieve the expected results?
13) Were project results or activities achieved on time?
14) How was your relationship with the OAS Country Office or General Secretariat staff in Washington? Did it facilitate the smooth implementation of the project?
15) How was the relationship between your organization and the OAS General Secretary managed? (please provide explanations)
Sustainability

16) If we were to suppose that there will be no further Cooperation Plan, will any of the project’s results (especially immediate outcomes) continue in the future? If not, please provide reasons why.

17) To what extent are the achievements and changes that the project has contributed to likely to last? What factors (positive or negative) are likely to support or hinder (i.e., bottlenecks) the sustainability achievements?

Forward Looking Considerations

18) What are the main lessons learned on formulation, design, implementation, management and sustainability of the project?

19) Is there anything else you would like to share with us at this stage?

Thank you very much for your collaboration.
Beneficiaries

*Interview questions should be based on specific projects. Prior to the interview, review the specific project the beneficiary has been involved in and make sure that questions are asked in relation that project.*

**Introduction/Background**

1) Please describe your particular group of beneficiaries.

2) What is your current position, and since when have you held it?

3) In what ways, and since when, have you been aware of or engaged in the OAS/CIDA project?

**Country Context**

4) What are the key things that we need to know about your country that may affect the results or implementation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan? (e.g., political, economic, donor landscape, etc.)

**Relevance**

5) How did the OAS/CIDA project respond to needs and priorities of your country/entity?

6) Would you be able to tell how the OAS got financing for this project? *(to understand what kind of visibility Canada got in the Cooperation Plan)*

**Effectiveness**

7) From your point of view, what have been the key achievements of the project in your country? *(Probe: What specifically is expected to happen in your country, in relation to the project, over the next 12-18 months?)*

8) How would you explain the project’s successes and missed opportunities? What has worked well? What hasn’t? What have been the key factors that have supported or hindered success?

9) Which activities of the project have been the most and the least useful/successful? Why?

10) What is your opinion as to the strengths and weaknesses of this specific project?

11) Are you aware of any unintended results? Please describe.

**Efficiency**

12) What comments do you have regarding the project’s **efficiency**? (Could you have accomplished the results (especially **outputs**) with lower budget/less time?)

13) Were project results or activities achieved on time?

**Sustainability**

14) If we were to suppose that there will be no further Cooperation Plan, will any of the project’s **results** (especially immediate outcomes) continue in the future? If not, please provide reasons why.
15) What factors (positive or negative) are likely to support or hinder (i.e. bottlenecks) the sustainability achievements?

**Forward Looking Considerations**

16) What are the main lessons learned on formulation, design, implementation, management and sustainability of the project?

17) Is there anything else you would like to share with us at this stage?

Thank you very much for your collaboration.
OAS in-Country Offices

Introduction/Background

1) What is your current position, and since when have you held it?

2) In what ways, and since when, have you been aware of or engaged in the OAS/CIDA project(s)?

3) Which individuals or unit do you interact with regarding the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan? Who do interact with, how, and how frequently?

Context

4) What are the key things that we should know about this country in relation to the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan?

5) Are there any sensitivities that we need to be aware of?

Relevance

6) To what extent did the Cooperation Plan respond to needs and priorities in this country?

7) Did the Cooperation Plan support the OAS mandate in this country? (Please be specific)

8) To what extent did the Cooperation Plan strengthen diplomatic relations between Canada and the OAS in your country?

Effectiveness

9) From your point of view, what have been the key achievements of the Cooperation Plan in this country since 2012?

10) How would you explain the Cooperation Plan’s successes and missed opportunities? What has worked well? What hasn’t? What have been the key factors that have supported or hindered success?

11) How well has the cross-cutting issue of gender been integrated in the Cooperation Plan and corresponding projects in this country? (suggest a scale from 1-10 where 1 would mean no gender integration and 10 would mean full and complete gender integration and ask for explanation)

Efficiency, Management and Operations

12) How transparent and appropriate are the application and selection/approval mechanisms for CIDA-2 projects? What kind of support is available from the General Secretariat to navigate these processes?

13) What have been strengths and weaknesses of the performance of partner organizations in the implementation of projects in this country?

14) Have there been any challenges, e.g., related to CIDA-2 projects approval or disbursements, capacity, partner relations, or reporting? If yes, how have these been resolved, and by whom?

15) Has the management and oversight of projects in Washington been adequate to ensure the achievement of results on time? To what extent does your office participate in the monitoring of projects (results and/or financial)?
16) In what ways, if any, could the Cooperation Plan have been more efficient (i.e., achieved similar results using fewer resources)?

**Sustainability**

17) If we were to suppose that there will be no further Cooperation Plan, will any of the project’s results (especially immediate outcomes) continue in the future in this country? If not, please provide reasons why.

18) What factors (positive or negative) are likely to support or hinder (i.e. bottlenecks) the sustainability achievements?

**Forward Looking Considerations**

19) What could further enhance financed projects relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency in this country?

20) Is there anything else you would like to share with us at this stage?

Thank you very much for your collaboration.
Appendix V  List of Documents Consulted

CIM1202 – Enhancing capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belem Do Para Convention

- OAS. Budget “Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belem Do Para Convention” July 2012-June 2015.
- OAS GS. Project Profile: CIM1202 – Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belem Do Para Convention.
- OAS. Project Status Report for Decision-Makers “Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belem Do Para Convention” CIM1202. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. April 5, 2013
- OAS. Project Status Report for Decision-Makers “Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belem Do Para Convention” CIM1202. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. April 3, 2014
- OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: CIM1202 – Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to Implement the Belem Do Para Convention.
- OAS. Project Status Report based on progress RPPI “Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belem Do Para Convention” CIM1202. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. May 14, 2014.
- OAS. Verification based on the final report “Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to Implement the Belem Do Para Convention” CIM1202. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Sept. 15, 2015

CIM1203 – Bringing women’s rights and gender equality instruments to public policy formulation in the Americas

- OAS GS. Project Profile: CIM1203 – Bringing a women’s rights and gender equality instruments to public policy formulation in the Americas.


SAF1201 – Strengthen OAS’ capacity to implement results based management

OAS. Budget “Strengthen OAS’ capacity to implement results-based management” June 2012-June 2015.

OAS GS. Project Profile: SAF1201 – Strengthen OAS’ capacity to implement results based management.

OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Strengthen OAS’ capacity to implement results-based management” SAF1201. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Oct. 6, 2014


OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Strengthen OAS’ capacity to implement results-based management” SAF1201. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. April 5, 2013

OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SAF1201 – Strengthen OAS’ capacity to implement results based management.


SAJ1201 – Equitable access to Public Information

- OAS GS. Project Profile: SAJ1201 – Equitable access to Public Information.

SAJ1202 – International commercial dispute settlement and arbitration related to trade

- OAS GS. Project Profile: SAJ1202 – International commercial dispute settlement and arbitration related to trade.


**SAJ1203 – Secured Transactions Reform: Promotion of the Model Inter-American Law on Secured Transactions and its model registry regulations**

- **OAS. Budget “Secured Transactions Reform: Promotion of the Model Inter-American Law on Secured Transactions and its model registry regulations” 2012-2015.**

- **OAS GS. Project Profile: SAJ1203 – Secured Transactions Reform: Promotion of the Model Inter-American Law on Secured Transactions and its model registry regulations.**


- **OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SAJ1203 – Secured Transactions Reform: Promotion of the Model Inter-American Law on Secured transactions and its model registry regulations”.**


SAJ1204 – Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC

- OAS. Budget “Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC”. Jul. 12, 2012.
- OAS GS. Project Profile: SAJ1204 – Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC.
- OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC” SAJ1204. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Apr. 29, 2015.
- OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SAJ1204 – Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC.”
- Verification based on the final report. “Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC” SAJ1204. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Apr. 29, 2015.

SER1201 – Improved consultation with civil society and social actors regarding OAS programs, activities and policy-making processes of OAS political organs

- OAS. Budget “Improved consultations with civil society and social actors regarding OAS programs, activities and policy-making processes of OAS political organs” 2012-2015.
- OAS GS. Project Profile: SAJ1204 – Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC.
- OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Improved consultations with civil society and social actors regarding OAS programs, activities and policy-making processes of OAS political programs” SER1201. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Apr. 8, 2013.
- OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Improved consultations with civil society and social actors regarding OAS programs, activities and policy-making processes of OAS political programs” SER1201. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. May. 28, 2015.


SER1202 – Promoting awareness of the importance of responsible business practices among key stakeholders of the Inter-American Cooperation Network

- OAS. Budget “Promoting awareness of the importance of responsible business practices among key stakeholders of the Inter-American Cooperation Network” 2012-2015.

- OAS GS. Project Profile: SER1202 – Promoting awareness of the importance of responsible business practices among key stakeholders of the Inter-American Cooperation Network.


- OAS. Report on Progress of Project Implementation (RPPI) for OAS-CIDA Plan II Projects “Promoting awareness of the importance of responsible business practices among key


**SID1207 – Capacity building program of country officials for the sustainable use of natural resources**

- OAS. Budget “Capacity building program of country officials for the sustainable use of natural resources” April 2012- March 2015.
- OAS GS. Project Profile: SID1207 – Capacity building program of country officials for the sustainable use of natural resources.

**SID1210 – Trade-related Technical Assistance (TRTA) Program for Government Officials Responsible for Negotiating and Implementing Trade Agreements**

- OAS GS. Project Profile: SID1210 – Trade-related Technical Assistance (TRTA) Program for Government Officials Responsible for Negotiating and Implementing Trade Agreements.


**SID1211 – Institutional Strengthening of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Support Institutions for Promoting the Productivity, Innovation and Internationalization of this Sector**


- OAS GS. Project Profile: SID1211 – Institutional Strengthening of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Support Institutions for Promoting the Productivity, Innovation and Internationalization of this Sector.


- OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SID1211 – Institutional Strengthening of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Support Institutions for Promoting the Productivity, Innovation and Internationalization of this Sector.


### SID1212 – Promoting Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Program

- OAS. Budget “Promotion of Corporate Social responsibility in Latin America” March 2012-March 2015.
- OAS GS. Project Profile: SID1212 – Promotion of Corporate Social responsibility in Latin America.
- OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SID1212 – Promoting Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Program.

### SID1217 – Inter-American Collaborative Networks

- OAS. Budget “Inter-American Collaborative Networks” 2012-2015.
- OAS GS. Project Profile: SID1217 – Inter-American Collaborative Networks.
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- OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SID1217 – Inter-American Collaborative Networks.


SPA1208 – Strengthening Public Sector Capacities in Latin America and the Caribbean


- OAS GS. Project Profile: SPA1208 – Strengthening Public Sector Capacities in Latin America and the Caribbean.


SPA1210 – Political Analysis System


- OAS GS. Project Profile: SPA1210 – Political Analysis System.

SPA1211 – Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes


- OAS. Budget “Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes” 2012-2015.

- OAS GS. Project Profile: SPA1211 – “Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes.”

- OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes” SPA1211. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Apr. 5, 2013.

- OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes” SPA1211. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. June 26, 2014.

- OAS. Report on Progress of Project Implementation (RPPI) for OAS-CIDA Plan II Projects “Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes” SPA1214. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Oct. 4, 2013.

- OAS. Report on Progress of Project Implementation (RPPI) for OAS-CIDA Plan II Projects “Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes” SPA1214. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Sept. 15, 2015.

- Verification based on the final report. “Strengthening the capacity of electoral bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections in countries benefiting from OAS/EOMs, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes” SPA1211. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Sept. 16, 2015.

SPA1215 – Inter-American Cooperation Mechanism for Effective Public Management (MEGICEP)

- OAS. Budget “Inter-American Cooperation Mechanism for Effective Public Management” June 2012-May 2015.

- OAS GS. Project Profile: SPA1215 – “Inter-American Cooperation Mechanism for Effective Public Management.”


OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SPA1215 – Inter-American Collaborative Networks for Effective Public Management.


SPA1216 – Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation

OAS. Budget “Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation” 2013-2014. July 30, 2013.

OAS GS. Project Profile: SPA1215 – Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation.


OAS. Project Status Report for Decision Makers “Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation” SPA1216. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Oct. 6, 2014.

OAS. OAS-Canada Plan Supplementary Final Narrative Report: SPA1216 - Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation.

OAS. Report on Progress of Project Implementation (RPPI) for OAS-CIDA Plan II Projects “Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation” SPA1216. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. April 5, 2013.


OAS. Report on Progress of Project Implementation (RPPI) for OAS-CIDA Plan II Projects “Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation” SPA1216. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. May 15, 2015.

Verification based on the final report. “Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes with a focus on equal participation” SPA1216. Prepared by the Department of Planning and Evaluation. Sept. 16, 2015.
SUM1201 – Strengthening performance management capacity of the OAS and improving consultation and outreach with stakeholders

- OAS GS. Project Profile: SUM1201 – Strengthening performance management capacity of the OAS and improving consultation and outreach with stakeholders.
## Appendix VI  List of CIDA-2 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CIM1202</td>
<td>Enhancing the capacity of OAS Member States to implement the Belem Do Para Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CIM1203</td>
<td>Bringing women's rights and gender equality instruments to public policy formulation in the Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OSG1201</td>
<td>Strengthening OAS Capacity to effectively respond to emerging priorities, including prevention of crises, peace building, and/or respond to urgent or critical matters in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SAF1201</td>
<td>Strengthen OAS’ capacity to implement results-based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SAJ1201</td>
<td>Equitable Access to Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SAJ1202</td>
<td>International commercial dispute settlement and arbitration related to trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SAJ1203</td>
<td>Secured Transactions Reform: Promotion of the Model Inter-American Law on Secured Transactions and its Model Registry Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SAJ1204</td>
<td>Increasing the capacity of member states to enhance transparency in connection with the MESICIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SER1201</td>
<td>Improved consultation with civil society and social actors regarding OAS programs, activities and policy making processes of OAS political organs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SER1202</td>
<td>Promoting awareness of the importance of responsible business practices among key stakeholders of the Inter-American Cooperation Network - COOPERANET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SID1207</td>
<td>Capacity Building Program of Country Officials for the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SID1210</td>
<td>Trade-related technical assistance (TRTA) program for government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SID1211</td>
<td>Institutional Strengthening of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Support Institutions for Promoting the Productivity, Innovation and Internationalization of this Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SID1212</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SID1217</td>
<td>Inter-American Collaborative Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SPA1208</td>
<td>Strengthening Public Sector Capacities in Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SPA1210</td>
<td>Political Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SPA1211</td>
<td>Strengthened abilities of Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs) to organize and administer elections, incorporating a gender perspective into their activities and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SPA1215</td>
<td>Inter-American Cooperation Mechanism for Effective Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SPA1216</td>
<td>Improving OAS technical capacity to observe electoral processes in the region with a focus on equal participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SUM1201</td>
<td>Strengthening the performance management capacity of the OAS and improving consultation and outreach with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix VII  Country Development Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Business Environment</th>
<th>Access to Markets</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTA RICA</strong>&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fights against poverty and reduction of inequalities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent and efficient government taking measures against corruption</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth and job creation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</strong>&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A democratic and social state, with ethical, transparent, and efficient institutions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An equal society with rights and opportunities [...] that promotes gradual poverty reduction and social inequality reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An equal and integrated society, innovative, diversified, plural, quality oriented and sustainable that generates high growth with equity and dignified employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A society with a culture of sustainable production and consumption which manages with efficiency and equity risks, environmental protection and natural resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EL SALVADOR</strong>&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate productive employment through a model of sustained economic growth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote equal Access to education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEMOCRACY</th>
<th>BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>ACCESS TO MARKETS</th>
<th>GENDER EQUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectively strengthen public safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAMAICA</strong>³⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaicans are empowered to achieve their fullest potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jamaican society is safe, cohesive, and just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica’s economy is prosperous</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica has a healthy natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEXICO</strong>³⁵</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PANAMA</strong>³⁶</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of human capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARAGUAY</strong>³⁷</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction and social development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguayan insertion in the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Evaluation of OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Business Environment</th>
<th>Access to Markets</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERU</strong>^38</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights and social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and access to services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy, diversification, competitiveness and employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial development and productive infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, biodiversity, and disaster risk management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Appendix VIII  List of Findings

Finding 1: All consulted stakeholders considered CIDA-2 activities highly relevant to their organizations; the document review found that projects were well-aligned with the national development plans of OAS Member States. However, it is not clear whether the countries selected to receive services from each project were those with the greatest need for those services.

Finding 2: There is strong alignment between CIDA-2 and the Government of Canada’s Strategy for Engagement in the Americas, which places high importance on economic prosperity, democracy and fostering lasting relationships.

Finding 3: All CIDA-2 projects supported the overall mandates of the OAS. However, given the multiple OAS unfunded mandates and its limited financial and human resources, CIDA-2 projects tend to have more relevance in areas where the OAS is recognized as a major player, where it has expertise (niche) and technical capacity (e.g., promoting democracy and defending human rights).

Finding 4: Most CIDA-2 projects were successful in carrying out planned activities and producing expected outputs; overall, CIDA-2 delivered approximately 73 per cent of its outputs. However, follow-up activities that are necessary in order to achieve planned outcomes, were generally, not included nor financed in project design.

Finding 5: While there is little documented evidence of “immediate” outcomes, consulted stakeholders noted that CIDA-2 activities contributed to new knowledge among training participants, raising awareness on some issues, and building networks. Factors that enhanced outcome achievement included work with long-term OAS partners and work in areas where the Secretariat had previous experience.

Finding 6: At the organizational level, CIDA-2 encouraged the development of General Secretariat staff capacities for gender mainstreaming in all projects. At the project level, the integration of the gender perspective in CIDA-2 projects was mostly limited to design (e.g., gender-sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data); there is little evidence of outcomes related to gender mainstreaming.

Finding 7: CIDA-2 made progress in integrating results-based management principles throughout the project and program cycle. All CIDA-2 projects had results frameworks with indicators at the output and outcome levels. The main issues noted were poorly specified or overly ambitious outcomes and indicators, and the lack of baseline data and theory of change.

Finding 8: CIDA-2 led to the partial institutionalization of an RBM culture in the General Secretariat. Staff involved acquired some skills in managing for development results and greater awareness of the benefits of managing through an RBM approach, but considerably more work is needed in this regard. Other General Secretariat activities are not managed in this manner, which indicates that the OAS is still struggling to fully adopt an RBM managerial approach.
Finding 9: It does not appear at all likely that CIDA-2 will achieve its intermediate nor its ultimate outcomes. Overly ambitious outcomes, lack of follow-up and the dispersion of resources across many small projects in several countries may have limited the achievement of higher-level results.

Finding 10: CIDA-2 supported the creation of networks and helped lay the foundation for new laws and electoral reform. It also helped some project partners carry out activities they had planned but lacked sufficient resources to implement.

Finding 11: Overall, the design of CIDA-2 had flaws, including vague selection criteria, overambitious outcomes and unclear results chains, and inefficient allocation of financial and human resources.

Finding 12: The efficiency of CIDA-2 was affected by some delays in project start-up and the cost of short-term contracts, in areas in which the OAS did not have expertise, which represented approximately 42 per cent of the overall resources of the Cooperation Plan.

Finding 13: The General Secretariat put a great deal of effort into the management and implementation of CIDA-2 and respected the terms of the Grant Arrangement with the Government of Canada. Some activities were modified and funds reallocated, all with appropriate justification. However, most CIDA-2 projects websites showed low utilization and updates.

Finding 14: CIDA-2's financial reporting systems were sharper than CIDA-1's and allowed project managers to know where resources went and to have real time access to budgetary information. However, there are still serious limitations in the General Secretariat's financial systems.

Finding 15: The CIDA-2 monitoring mechanisms did not always facilitate data collection for activities and outputs. Data on outcomes was not collected after implementation as no mechanism was put in place to do so.

Finding 16: The General Secretariat addressed, or partially addressed, five of the ten recommendations of the CIDA-1 evaluation. Two recommendations require consensus from Member States (on strategic planning and harmonization of reporting). Other recommendations that have not been addressed include the need for demand-driven project identification and better follow-up of activities.

Finding 17: Leadership of CIDA-2 varied throughout the grant period. During the first two years, Senior Management exercised oversight, while in the third year, leadership was mostly delegated to the DPE. The General Secretariat did not implement the governance structure in conformity with the Project Management Plan.

Finding 18: The oversight provided by the representative of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS was considered very satisfactory.

Finding 19: In-country partners such as Government ministries were very satisfied with their interactions with the General Secretariat. However, Canadian embassy staff and most OAS staff in country offices had never heard of the Cooperation Plan or its projects.
Finding 20: The sustainability of project results appears to be minimal. There are several reasons for this: a) project outputs, size and scope (mostly workshops) were not appropriate to lead to longer-term results; b) project design, which in many cases did not include follow-up; and c) project teams were not expected to try to leverage additional funds beyond resources provided by CIDA-2.

Finding 21: CIDA-2 provided more than 20 per cent of the annual budgets of six OAS General Secretariat departments. There were no plans to replace this funding or to sustain the activities it supported when the Cooperation Plan ended.