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1. Introduction

Volume II contains the ToRs, the Evaluation Matrix, the bibliography of consulted documents, the list of respondents and the interview protocols used.
2. Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. BACKGROUND

1.1 In 2008, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) entered into a $20 million, three-year agreement with the Organization of American States (OAS) to help address a variety of broad regional issues with a multilateral approach which would complement the government of Canada’s bilateral approach throughout the Americas.

1.2 As the principle multilateral platform for political dialogue and collective action for the entire Western Hemisphere, the OAS strives to promote democracy, strengthen human rights, foster peace and security, and address the shared complex problems caused by poverty, terrorism, drugs and corruption.

1.3 The member countries set major policies and goals through the General Assembly, which gathers the hemisphere’s ministers of foreign affairs once a year in regular session. Ongoing actions are guided by the Permanent Council, made up of ambassadors appointed by the Member States.

1.4 To carry out the programs and policies set by the political bodies, six specialized secretariats coordinate OAS efforts in several broad areas; the Secretariat for Multidimensional Security (SMS), the Secretariat for Political Affairs (SPA), the Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI), the Secretariat for External Relations (SER), the Secretariat for Legal Affairs (SLA), and the Secretariat for Administration and Finance (SAF).

1.5 Also under the OAS umbrella are several offices and specialized agencies that have considerable autonomy including the Inter-American human rights bodies, the Inter-American Children’s Institute, the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, the Inter-American Commission of Women, the Inter-American Committee on Ports and the Inter-American Telecommunication Commission.

1.6 The annual budget of the OAS Secretariat is funded by quotas that each Member State contributes to a Regular Fund. However, many of the key programs and activities carried out by the Organization are made possible through financial support of strategic partners such as the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Through the current cooperation plan, CIDA has played a pivotal role in enhancing democratic governance and more effective development programming in OAS Member States. The grant supports five overall program areas:

- The Promotion of Policy Dialogue and Summit/Ministerial Follow-Up to reinforce the OAS as the principle multilateral forum in the Western Hemisphere and consolidate the Summit of the Americas process into the leading body for defining the agenda of the Inter-American system

- The Strengthening Sustainable Democratic Governance in the Americas to provide programming directed at the public sector institutions and civil society organizations of member states in areas such as the modernization of the state, development of civil registries, judicial reform, anti-corruption mechanisms, public administration including public oversight and transparency systems, and crisis prevention and resolutions mechanisms

- The Strengthening Institutions for Development to provide programming directed at public sector institutions and civil society organizations of member states that target human resources and institutional capacity building, the implementation of sound public policies and sustainable, efficient, effective and accountable programs to their citizens. This will involve programming in areas such as e-government, disaster mitigation, social development, education, energy, the media, migration, trade and corporate social responsibility
- The promotion of Gender Equality and Vulnerable Groups to provide programming to support gender mainstreaming efforts with the OAS’ policies and programs, as well as to support the social inclusion and more equitable access for vulnerable groups, including Indigenous Peoples and Afro-descendants

- OAS Institutional Strengthening/Capacity Building and evaluation and emerging priorities to provide programming to further consolidate OAS efforts in areas such as strategic planning, project management, results based management and reporting, financial modernization and human resources management

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE CONSULTANCY

2.1 The objective of the Consultancy is to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011. The evaluation should focus particularly in the delivery of the main outputs and the Immediate and Intermediate Outcomes of the five programs and the Final Outcome of the Plan consigned in the Logic Framework approved by CIDA and the General Secretariat of the OAS on December 4, 2008 (Annex I).

2.2 For background information a copy of the following documents is attached:
- OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan Steering Committee Meeting, July 2009 (Annex II);
- OAS/CIDA Mid-Plan Update dated September 30, 2010 (Annex III); and,

2.3 To achieve this objective the Consultant shall:
- Conduct a formative and summative evaluation in order to identify the main results of the programs.
- Analyze the formulation, design, implementation and management of the Plan and its Programs and make recommendations as needed.
- Evaluate the sustainability of the main results of the programs.
- 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.

III. MAIN ACTIVITIES

3.1 Develop a detailed Work Plan, including the description and chronology of the activities to be carried out, the reports to be submitted and the deliverables of the evaluation. The consultant may include recommendations to the TORs as appropriate.

3.2 Develop the Evaluation Framework which will contribute to determine if the programs were implemented efficiently and effectively and generated the expected results. The Evaluation Framework shall include, at a minimum, a description of the methodology or design strategy of the evaluation; a plan for data collection and analysis of the information; the identification of the output and outcome indicators; the instruments to be used for data collection and the calendar for data collection, analysis of the information and production and delivery of reports; the table of contents of the final evaluation report. The evaluation shall use quantitative and qualitative methodologies and take into account the opinions of key stakeholders.
3.3 Review all the relevant documentation needed such as: documents related to the plan and programs formulation, the logic framework, the performance measurements frameworks, the progress reports and any means of verification of the outputs.

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

3.5 Measure the programs’ performance in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. The Consultant shall identify the indicators - either those included in the Logic Framework or those suggested by the Consultant - and the corresponding data that serves as evidence of the achievement of the expected results. He/she shall analyze the extent to which the expected results were achieved as well as identify unplanned results that may have occurred.

IV. DELIVERABLES

Number of Weeks after Contract has been signed by both Parties:

4.1 Detailed Work Plan (2)
4.2 Evaluation Framework (3)
4.3 Proposed Table of Contents for the evaluation final report (4)
4.4 Draft report (7)
4.5 Final Evaluation Report including Power Point Presentation (9)

V. PROGRESS PAYMENTS

The Consultant shall be compensated as follows:

20% Upon delivery of the Work Plan
20% Upon delivery of the Evaluation Framework
20% Upon delivery of the Proposed Table of Contents
20% Upon delivery of the Draft Final report
20% Upon delivery of the Final Evaluation Report accompanied by a Power Point presentation

VI. EXPERIENCE

The Contractor should posses no less than ten (10) years experience in international project/program results-based monitoring and evaluation. The evaluation team should include, at a minimum, a specialist in institutional strengthening and capacity building and a specialist in project/program evaluation.

VII. DURATION OF THE CONSULTANCY

The Contractor shall commence its work no later than two (2) weeks after signing the Contract, and be finalized at the latest ten (10) weeks after the signing of the Contract.
3. Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Foci</th>
<th>Sub Foci</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)</th>
<th>Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>External Context</td>
<td>What have been the key changes in the relevant international context that have had or may have an impact on the OAS CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011? What have been the implications of these changes? What have been the key changes in the relevant external contexts of OAS partners that have had or may have an impact on the OAS CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011? What have been the implications of these changes? What have been the key changes in CIDA’s context (e.g. priorities, resources, policies) that may have impacted CIDA and the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011? What have been the implications of these changes?</td>
<td>Types of changes and implications. Changes in degree of acceptance/support of/or for the OAS as a forum at national, regional and North-South levels. Changes in terms of support for prioritization of mandates; in terms of implementation of a results-based culture; in terms of performance monitoring and measurement.</td>
<td>Document review Interviews with technical staff of GS/OAS Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interview with selected Member States missions to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal OAS context</td>
<td></td>
<td>What have been the key changes in the relevant internal context of the OAS (i.e., political, social, economic, cultural, OAS membership and so on) that have had or may have an impact on OAS CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011?</td>
<td>Types of changes and implications. Depth and breadth of the reorganization and reform (organizational renewal) process implemented at the GS. Acceptance and implementation of results-based strategic planning, programming, performance monitoring and evaluation. Changes in degree of commitment to gender equality, and the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Descendants, as evidenced in programming. Changes in process of preparation and support for meetings of political bodies.</td>
<td>Document review Interviews with technical staff of GS/OAS Interview with selected Member States missions to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Foci</td>
<td>Sub Foci</td>
<td>Key Questions</td>
<td>Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)</td>
<td>Information Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Congruence with global and regional priorities</td>
<td>To what extent has the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 corresponded to changing global and regional needs and priorities?</td>
<td>Number and types of changes made to the Cooperation Plan to respond to relevant needs and priorities.</td>
<td>Interviews with GS/OAS staff, Interviews with GS/OAS staff, Interviews with selected Member States missions to the OAS, Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congruence with OAS Member States’ priorities</td>
<td>To what extent has the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 corresponded to changing regional needs and priorities of OAS member states?</td>
<td>Number and types of changes made to the Cooperation Plan to respond to relevant needs and priorities.</td>
<td>Interviews with GS/OAS staff, Interviews with selected Member States missions to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congruence with GS/OAS priorities</td>
<td>To what extent have the five identified programs under the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 support the GS/OAS Strategic plan (or equivalent)? To what extent do the five priority areas support the OAS Programmatic competitive advantage?</td>
<td>Alignment of the five areas with OAS/Member States priority setting exercise Perception of CIDA, GS and OAS Member States regarding the adequacy of the alignment</td>
<td>Document Review, Interviews with GS/OAS staff, Interviews with selected Member States missions to the OAS, Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011:</td>
<td>To what extent has the planned immediate and intermediate outputs outcomes (if identified) of the five programs, as well as the final outcomes in the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 been identified? To what extent did the projects undertaken contribute to any noted changes? To what extent did the Cooperation Plan contribute to any notable changes?</td>
<td>Evidence of the realization of the planned outputs, immediate and intermediate outcomes of the five program areas in the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011. Evidence of the Cooperation Plan’s contribution to any noted changes (through the Plan’s outputs). Reasons for any key variances.</td>
<td>Document review, Interviews with project staff, Interviews with (selected) Member States Project beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of results</td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are the results of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 likely to be sustained over time? To what extent are there feasible strategies in place to encourage and support their continued sustainability over time? What will be required, if anything, to increase the likelihood that the results will be sustained over time?</td>
<td>Provision of internal OAS resources to sustain activities beyond the Cooperation Plan Evidence of funding (CIDA or other agency) to support projects beyond the Cooperation Plan Evidence of investment/leveraging of project resources funding by Member States</td>
<td>Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC), Interviews with GS/OAS staff, Interviews with selected Member State missions to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Foci</td>
<td>Sub Foci</td>
<td>Key Questions</td>
<td>Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)</td>
<td>Information Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Appropriateness of Design</td>
<td>To what extent were the results as defined in the logical framework for the OAS CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic Time bound (SMART)? To what extent was OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 guided by a clear appropriate program logic? To what extent was this logic known and understood by its key stakeholders? To what extent did the conceptual framework provide a good vehicle to communicate to key stakeholders? To what extent has the logic model been relevant given OAS’s internal policies, priorities, strategic directions, resources and institutional culture? To what extent have the outputs and outcomes of the logic model been relevant in the five identified programs?</td>
<td>Evidence of the use of quality criteria for indicators (e.g., SMART) in the logical/results frameworks. Evidence of the usefulness of the Plan’s logical framework in terms of measuring program results. Evidence of the extent that the Plan was guided by a clear and appropriate program logic. Evidence of the extent that the logic was known and understood by key stakeholders. Evidence that the logical framework acted as a useful vehicle to communicate results to key stakeholders. Evidence of the relevance of the outputs and outcomes of the logic model in the five identified program areas.</td>
<td>Document review Interviews with GS/OAS project staff Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interviews with DPE staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Resource Utilization</td>
<td>Have the right amount and type of human resources been provided for the Initiatives and overall OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 results based management?</td>
<td>Alignment of project resources allocation with OAS areas of expertise or competitive advantage Alignment of project resource allocation with OAS staff expertise Adequacy of resources to undertake projects</td>
<td>Number or percentage of Projects whose outputs were completed as planned, and within time Adequacy of budget for project outputs produced Cost per unit of outputs (if available)</td>
<td>Document review Cooperation Plan budget allocation Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interviews with GS/OAS staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have the right amount and type of financial resources been provided for the Initiatives and overall Cooperation Plan’ management in order to enable the capacity to adequately plan, manage, monitor and evaluate programming?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with GS/OAS staff Expert judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Foci</td>
<td>Sub Foci</td>
<td>Key Questions</td>
<td>Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)</td>
<td>Information Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                |          | Is the allocation of resources adequately balanced among lines of expenditures? | Percentage of budget on areas of expenditures  
Ratio Personnel cost / Program cost |                       |
| Informed and Timely Action | To what extent were the planned outputs of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 delivered within the time frame and the planned resources for the targeted entities (GS/OAS, civil society organizations, public sector institutions, various regional initiatives)? What were the reasons for any key variances? | Percentage of planned outputs of the Cooperation Plan that have been completed for each program area. | Literature review  
Interviews with CIDA  
Interviews with GS/OAS staff  
Interviews with project staff |
| Partnership | Is there shared responsibility and accountability for results between GS/OAS and CIDA? What have been the implications of the partnership arrangement? | Clarity and adequacy of roles and responsibilities as expressed in MOU  
Perception of CIDA and OAS representatives | Document review  
Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC)  
Interviews with GS/OAS staff |
Frequency and nature of communication between CIDA and OAS  
the Cooperation Plan | Document review  
Interviews with CIDA  
Interviews with GS/OAS staff |
|               | Have roles and responsibilities been clearly defined within GS/OAS and CIDA for the management and implementations of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011? | Frequency and nature of difficulties encountered (if any) in the roles and responsibilities have been clearly defined within OAS. | Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC)  
Interviews with GS/OAS staff |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | To what extent has the GS/OAS established and maintained an appropriate system to monitor and report in meaningful and useful ways on OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 outputs, outcomes and impacts to OAS’s key stakeholders (including CIDA)? | Content frequency and quality of projects monitoring reports  
Nature and quality of evaluations of projects (if any)  
Nature an frequency of report on the overall Cooperation Plan | Document review  
Interview with project staff  
Expert judgment |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Foci</th>
<th>Sub Foci</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)</th>
<th>Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has reporting been timely, efficient and relevant, based on the Plan structure and design? Are reporting systems carried out in an efficient and logical manner (i.e. by project, program, or cumulatively)?</td>
<td>Evidence of adjustments made to projects or to the Cooperation based on monitoring or evaluation data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned and Future Directions</td>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>What are the main lessons of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 for GS? OAS? CIDA? Others?</td>
<td>Type of key operational and development lessons learned</td>
<td>Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) &lt;br&gt; Interviews with GS/OAS staff &lt;br&gt; Interviews with project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future directions</td>
<td>What are the key implications of OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 findings, conclusions and lessons learned for GS/OAS’s future directions? Future programming? Future partnership with strategic partners such as CIDA? What are the key changes that the OAS should make to utilize the results of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 evaluation most effectively?</td>
<td>List of key changes that the OAS should make to utilize the results of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 evaluation most effectively</td>
<td>Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) &lt;br&gt; Interviews with GS/OAS staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Permanent Mission of Belize to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Alice Victoria Virgill-Rolle</td>
<td>Alternate Representative</td>
<td>Permanent Mission of Bahamas to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Giroux</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Mission</td>
<td>Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIDA Staff Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annick Amyot</td>
<td>Senior Development Officer (OAS, PAHO, IACHR, IIN)</td>
<td>Strategic Analysis, Operations and Regional Programming Division (SAORP), Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigitte d’Aoust</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Inter-American Program, Americas Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Rogers</td>
<td>Senior Development Officer</td>
<td>Colombia Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaetane Pouliot</td>
<td>Program Manager, Colombia</td>
<td>Colombia Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Murray</td>
<td>Senior Director</td>
<td>Strategic Analysis, Operations and Regional Programming, OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léa Beaudry</td>
<td>Governance Director</td>
<td>Governance Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lise Filiatrault</td>
<td>Regional Director General</td>
<td>Geographic Programs Branch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Interview Protocols

Donor

In August 2011, the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE) of the Organization of the American States (OAS) contracted Universalia, a Canadian Management Consulting Firm, to carry out the evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011.

One key focus of the evaluation is to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of this Cooperation Plan. This exercise should take approximately one hour.

Please be assured that your answers are confidential to Universalia and that any information or comments you provide will only be reported on in aggregated form, and without attributing direct quotes to identifiable individuals.

Thank you very much for your collaboration.

1) What is your role at CIDA and to what extent are you familiar with the project and the Cooperation Plan between CIDA and OAS in general?

2) From your perspective, what are the key elements of the Latin American context that suggest a need for enhancing democratic governance and more effective development programming in OAS Member States?

3) Share with me the priorities of CIDA with respect to improving democratic governance and reduced poverty and inequity in the Americas (budget, geographic focus, major types of work undertaken)?

4) What proportion (percentage or size of budget) of CIDA’s budget in improving democratic governance and more effective development programming is done in joint programs/projects with OAS?

5) How does the Cooperation Plan with OAS support CIDA’s broader strategy and objectives?

6) What have been the implications of the partnership arrangement? For which aspect of the Cooperation Plan CIDA has to collaborate with the OAS? How would you characterize your collaboration with the OAS (i.e. communication, collaboration, proactiveness of addressing issues, etc.)

7) From your perspective to what extent did the Cooperation Plan reach expected results? Which of the expected results were reached and which ones were not? why?

8) To what extent was the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan guided by clear appropriate program logic?

9) If you were to revisit the Cooperation Plan, what would you have changed? Why?

10) How would you characterize OAS as a CIDA partner for implementing work in Latin America? How does OAS compare with some of other CIDA partners in LAC?

11) What are the strongest and weakest points of the management of this Cooperation Plan? Please provide concrete examples if possible?

12) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various methods used by OAS to improve democratic governance and development programming (give examples)

13) To what extent are the results likely to be sustained over time?

14) What are the main lessons of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan for CIDA?
15) Is there any aspect of the Plan we have not discussed and that you would like to comment on?

16) Is there someone else in your organization that you would also suggest we interview to obtain additional information on the project?

Senior Management

In August 2011, the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE) of the Organization of the American States (OAS) contracted Universalia, a Canadian Management Consulting Firm, to carry out the evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011.

One key focus of the evaluation is to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of this Cooperation Plan. This exercise should take approximately one hour.

Please be assured that your answers are confidential to Universalia and that any information or comments you provide will only be reported on in aggregated form, and without attributing direct quotes to identifiable individuals.

Thank you very much for your collaboration.

1) 1. What role do you play in your work within the General Secretariat?
2) 2. How long have you been in the position you currently hold?
3) 4. What are the main objectives of the General Secretariat?
4) 5. How do you see the role of the General Secretariat within the OAS?
5) 6. What are the main strategic objectives of the General Secretariat?
6) 7. What is the role of the Cooperation Plan within these objectives of the Secretariat?
7) 8. How do these sets of programs fit in with the strategy for the Secretariat and the OAS?
8) 9. How do you see the role of – Improved democratic governance and reduced poverty and inequity in the Americas - within those objectives?
9) 10. How familiar are you with the specific programs and projects?
10) 11. What is your opinion as to the strengths and weaknesses of the Cooperation Plan?
11) 12. How do you see the role of CIDA in the activities of the Secretariat?
12) 13. How did CIDA come to support the activities of the Secretariat?
13) 14. What do you gain from CIDA’s involvement?
Program Management

In August 2011, the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE) of the Organization of the American States (OAS) contracted Universalia, a Canadian Management Consulting Firm, to carry out the evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011.

One key focus of the evaluation is to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of this Cooperation Plan. This exercise should take approximately one hour.

Please be assured that your answers are confidential to Universalia and that any information or comments you provide will only be reported on in aggregated form, and without attributing direct quotes to identifiable individuals.

Thank you very much for your collaboration.

1) What role do you play in your work as an Advisor in the xxxxxxxxxx? As the Leader of the program?

2) What are the main objectives of the Program?

3) What is the role of promoting policy dialogue and summit/ministerial follow-up within these objectives of the Secretariat / OAS? How does this program fit in with the strategy for the Secretariat and the OAS?

4) To what extent has the Cooperation Plan corresponded to global and regional needs and priorities? OAS Member States needs and priorities? OAS as an organization?

5) How is the program designed? What are the strengths and weakness of the project design?

6) Program logic, SMART, understanding of the program logic by stakeholders, etc.

7) Is there shared responsibility and accountability of results between OAS and CIDA? What have been the implications of the partnership arrangement?

8) What have been the strengths and weaknesses of overall program management / processes / tools? At the project level?

9) How effective was the program in achieving its objectives? Were anticipated objectives reached? Why or why not?

10) What have been the key changes in the relevant international / external / internal context that have had or may have an impact on the OAS CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011? What have been the implications of these changes?

11) How likely are projects achievements to be sustained after the end of the projects? What factors are likely to support or hinder the sustainability of results?

12) To what extent have the program under the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 been and remained relevant given OAS’s internal policies, priorities, strategic directions, resources and institutional culture?

13) Has the GS/OAS established and maintained an appropriate system to monitor and report in meaningful and useful ways on output, outcomes and impacts?

14) What are the main lessons of the program? The Cooperation Plan?

Project Managers

In August 2011, the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE) of the Organization of the American States (OAS) contracted Universalia, a Canadian Management Consulting Firm, to carry out the evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011.

One key focus of the evaluation is to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of this Cooperation Plan. This exercise should take approximately one hour.

Please be assured that your answers are confidential to Universalia and that any information or comments you provide will only be reported on in aggregated form, and without attributing direct quotes to identifiable individuals.

Thank you very much for your collaboration.

1) What is your role within OAS? What project(s) pertaining to our evaluation are you responsible for?

2) Who are the project’s stakeholders (donors, institutions, beneficiaries, etc)?

3) In what context does the project fit within OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011?

4) What initial needs or issues was the project trying to address? Who established these needs were relevant?

5) How is the project designed? Who participated in the project design?

6) What are the strengths and weakness of the project design?

7) Are those factors still relevant now? In the view of beneficiaries/state/OAS/donor priorities and needs?

8) How effective was the project in achieving its objectives?

9) Were anticipated results achieved in terms of identified outputs / outcomes / impacts?

10) Were unanticipated results achieved in terms of outputs/ outcomes / impacts? Please give specific examples.

11) From your point of view what factors have positively or negatively affected the project’s performance and how? Factors can include but are not limited to: choice and use of programming approaches/strategies; program design, management, coordination mechanisms.

12) Were financial and human resources sufficient for this project?

13) Were financial and human resources used efficiently and appropriately allocated within the project?

14) Were monitoring and evaluation systems put in place for this project?

15) To what extent has OAS established and maintained an appropriate system to monitor and report in meaningful and useful ways on this project’s outputs, outcomes and impacts?

16) How is quality control of project management addressed? Are there particular guidelines put in place and/or reporting that takes place?

17) What have been the strengths and weaknesses of overall project management/processes/tools?

18) If you could design and implement the project again, what changes would you make? Why?

19) How likely are project achievements to be sustained after the end of the project? What factors are likely to support or hinder the sustainability of results?
20) Are there any lessons that have been learned with regard to this project? E.g. related to successful and less successful strategies, human resource requirements, financial needs, time requirements etc.

**Permanent Missions to the OAS**

*In August 2011, the Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE) of the Organization of the American States (OAS) contracted Universalia, a Canadian Management Consulting Firm, to carry out the evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011.*

One key focus of the evaluation is to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of this Cooperation Plan. This exercise should take approximately one hour.

*Please be assured that your answers are confidential to Universalia and that any information or comments you provide will only be reported on in aggregated form, and without attributing direct quotes to identifiable individuals or countries.*

*Thank you very much for your collaboration.*

1) First, I would like to get your general impressions regarding Member States providing special funding to the General Secretariat in order to strengthen existing activities/responsibilities (e.g., Summits, elections monitoring) or to enable it to engage in certain activities (including new?) considered priority by those Member States. [The OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan was not the first time this happened.] Do you consider this to be a good practice / under what conditions yes and under what conditions no? Any particular general comments regarding sustainability?

2) I would like to ask you about the role of the GS in Hemispheric political affairs, particularly if you have noticed any important changes since approximately 2008. I am referring to the services of the GS, not the nature of the substantive role played – for example, degree of preparation of meetings such as the Summits of the Americas, the General Assemblies, etc. and the services provided to the Member States prior to, during, and following those meetings. Would you say that the services provided by the GS for these high-level meetings are better, about the same, or inferior to those provided prior to 2008? Can you give 2 or 3 examples? What kind of interaction does your Mission have with the Summits Secretariat?

3) There were approximately 40 different projects financed by the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan (or to which the Cooperation Plan contributed). I will not ask you about each of those projects, but rather show you the following list (LIST) of 16 projects we have included in a sample to be evaluated more closely. Could you please select 2 or 3 you/your country think(s) is important and/or have benefitted from? For each of those, could you please share your opinion regarding the following:
- Relevance – Degree of interest in/relevance to your country
- Effectiveness – Project’s direct effects
- Sustainability of effects (in country)
4) Is there any aspect of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan we have not discussed and that you would like to comment on?