Evaluation of the OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011

Final Report - Volume II

By:
Universalia Management Group

March 2012

Contents

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
EVALUATION OF THE OAS/CIDA COOPERATION PLAN 2008 – 2011

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-descendents

- 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,

- Statement of Appropriations as of March 31, 2011 (Annex IV).

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

Evaluation Foci	Sub Foci	Key Questions	Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)	Information Sources
Context	External Context	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?	Types of changes and implications. Changes in degree of acceptance/support of/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.	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
	Internal OAS context	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?	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.	Document review Interviews with technical staff of GS/OAS Interview with selected Member States missions to the OAS

Evaluation Foci	Sub Foci	Key Questions	Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)	Information Sources
Relevance	Congruence with global and regional priorities	To what extent has the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 corresponded to changing global and regional needs and priorities?	Number and types of changes made to the Cooperation Plan to respond to relevant needs and priorities.	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)
	Congruence with OAS Member States' priorities	To what extent has the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 corresponded to changing regional needs and priorities of OAS member states?	Number and types of changes made to the Cooperation Plan to respond to relevant needs and priorities.	Interviews with GS/OAS staff Interviews with selected Member States missions to the OAS
	Congruence with GS/OAS priorities	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?	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	Document Review Interviews with GS/OAS staff Interviews with selected Member States missions to the OAS Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC)
Effectiveness	OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011:	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?	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.	Document review Interviews with project staff Interviews with (selected) Member States Project beneficiaries
	Sustainability of results	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?	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	Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interviews with GS/OAS staff Interviews with selected Member State missions to the OAS

UNIVERSALIA

Evaluation Foci	Sub Foci	Key Questions	Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)	Information Sources
Efficiency	Appropriateness of Design	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?	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 logic model's alignment with OAS's internal policies, priorities, strategic directions, resources and institutional culture. Evidence of the relevance of the outputs and outcomes of the logic model in the five identified program areas.	Document review Interviews with GS/OAS project staff Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interviews with DPE staff.
	Appropriateness of Resource Utilization	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?	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	Document review Cooperation Plan budget allocation Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interviews with GS/OAS staff
		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?	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)	Interviews with GS/OAS staff Expert judgment

Evaluation Foci	Sub Foci	Key Questions	Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)	Information Sources
		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
	OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 Implementation Management:	Have the processes for communications, problem-solving, coordination and decision-making related to OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 Implementation worked effectively?	Approaches used for problem solving Frequency and nature of communication between CIDA and OAS n 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

UNIVERSALIA

Evaluation Foci	Sub Foci	Key Questions	Indicator Areas (qualitative and quantitative)	Information Sources
		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)?	Evidence of adjustments made to projects or to the Cooperation based on monitoring or evaluation data	
Lessons learned and Future Directions	Lessons Learned	What are the main lessons of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 for GS? OAS? CIDA? Others?	Type of key operational and development lessons learned	Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interviews with GS/OAS staff Interviews with project staff
	Future directions	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?	List of key changes that the OAS should make to utilize the results of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 evaluation most effectively	Interviews with CIDA (Ottawa and Washington, DC) Interviews with GS/OAS staff

4. Bibliography

Cooperation Plan Documentation

Organization of American States, (February 2012). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan. Final Report (July 10, 2008 to June 30, 2011).

Program Documentation – CIDA Program Results Report – Supporting Documents:

Organization of American States, (April 2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 – LFA Logic Model.

Organization of American States, (July 2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Specific Funds – Statement of Appropriations and Funds Available, List of Projects.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Consolidated List of Output.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Recollection of Results, Progress Final Report.

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan –Performance Measurement Framework, Program 1: Promotion of Policy Dialogue and Summit / Ministerial Follow up.

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan –Performance Measurement Framework, Program 2: Strenghtening Sustainable and Democratic Governance in the Americas.

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan –Performance Measurement Framework, Program 3: Strenghtening Institutions for Development.

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan –Performance Measurement Framework, Program 4: Gender Equality and Vulnerable Groups.

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan –Performance Measurement Framework, Program 5: OAS Institutional Strenghtening / Capacity Building.

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan Monitoring and Reporting – Progress Report, Year 2.

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 - Subprogram 1.2: Interim Narrative Report, Year 2.doc.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Subprogram 1.3: Results Template: MISPA.doc.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Subprogram 1.4 Results Template Civil Society Project.xlsx.

Organization of American States (2009). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 – Subprogram 1.4:Interim Narrative Report Year 1.doc (July 2008 – June 2009).

Organization of American States (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 – Subprogram 1.4:Interim Narrative Report Year 2.doc (July 2009 – June 2010).

Organization of American States (2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 – Subprogram 1.4:Interim Narrative Report Year 3.doc (July 2010 – June 2011).

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.1:Results Template: Mechanisms Public Policy.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Subprogram 2.2: MESISIC .

Peñailillo, Miguel (2009). U4,CMI: How prepared are we to assess real implementation of anti-corruption conventions?.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.2: Support Docs- P2-T2-S2-A3- IGPN.xlsx.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.2: Support Docs- P2-T2-S2-A3- MuNet.xlsx.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.2: Support Docs PII-2.1 – MESICIC.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.3: Results Template – Judicial Reform Program.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.4: Results Template – State Modernization Reform.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.4: Support Docs – P2-T4-S2-A1- Framework Transparency Report Inputs DIL ATI.doc.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 3.1: Results Template: New Trade Developments.xlsx.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 3.2: Results Template: Migration Workers.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 3.3: Results Template: CSR in LAC.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 3.4: Results Template: Collaborative Networks.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 4.1: Results Template: Gender Equality.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 4.2: Results Template.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 4.3: Results Template.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 4.4: Results Template: Indigenous Peoples and Affrondescendants Issues in OAS.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 4.4: Support Docs (2).doc.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 4.4: Support Docs(3).pdf.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 4.4: Support Docs(3).doc.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.1: Results Template: HR & IPSAS.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.2: Results Template: RBM.xlsx.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.3: Results Template.xls.xlsx.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.3: Support Docs (2).docx.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.3: Support Docs (3).doc.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.3: Support Docs.docx.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.3: Support Docs.pdf.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 5.4: Results Template – IT.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Mid Plan Update, Narrative Report (2008-2011).

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Financial Statement (July 10, 2008 to March 31, 2011).

Organization of American States (February 2012). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – LFA Logic Model (2008-2011).

Organization of American States (July 2009). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Steering Committee Meeting.

Organization of American States (2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Mid Plan Update.

Organization of American States, Department for Effective Public Management. Detalle Participantes Curso : Gestión de las Compras Públicas. Ed# 1 a 4.

Red Interamiericana Compras Gubernamentales (October 2011). Reporte Final: VII Conferencia Annual sobre Compras Gubernamentales de las Américas (18-20 October, 2011).

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010 – Subprogram 2.3: Strenghtening Sustainable and Democratic Governance in the Americas, Access to justice – Expenditures by Outputs.xls.

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010: Sumario Acceso a la Justicia.doc (March 2010 – June 2011).

Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010: Oficial form outputs for CIDA – Annex 1.doc.

Distinguished Leadership and Innovation Conference, Trinidad and Tobago (March 2011). The Competitive Advantage of Nations and Regions: Implications for the Caribbean.

Organization of American States (October 2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan: A Review of the CARIFORUM-EC Economic Partnership Agreement and the Trade Regulatory Framework in Belize.

Organization of American States (January 2012). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2010: OAS Sub program 3.1: Table on Main Outputs funding.doc

Organization of American States (August 2011). Inter-American Collaborative Networks: lessens learned

Ministry of Police and Justice. Proposals Resulting from OAS training Seminar from 27-29 April 2010.

Ministry of Police and Justice. Proposal Training Seminar 27-28 April 2010.

Royal St.Vincent and the Grenadines Police Force. St.Vincent HL Meet.Anex 2.

OAS Financial Documents

Organization of American States Department of Budgetary and Financial Services, (2011). GMS funds available expenditure details (January 2008 to October 2011).

Organization of American States, (2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Financial Statements (July 10, 2008 to June 30, 2011).

Organization of American States, (2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Specific Funds (July 10, 2008 to June 30, 2011).

Organization of American States, (September 2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Specific Funds – Statement of Appropriations and Funds Available, (Details by activity).

Organization of American States, (2010). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan – Specific Funds – Statements of Contributions, Allotment to Programs and Statement in Fund Balance, (July 10, 2008 to August 31, 2009).

Canadian International Development Agency, (2011). Investment Performance Report (2008 to 2010).

OAS Priority Exercise – Mandates

Organization of American States (February 2011). Copy of Z-Resultados Paises_Compilado normal.xls.

Reports and other Documents

Organization of American States (November 2003). Final Report: Management Study of the Operations of the General Secretariat – Part I: Executive Summary.

Organization of American States (November 2003). Final Report: Management Study of the Operations of the General Secretariat – Part II: Detailed Observations and Options.

Organization of American States (November 2003). Final Report: Management Study of the Operations of the General Secretariat – Part III: Appendices to the Final Report.

Cowater International Inc. (November 2006). Final Report: Consultancy to Review the Organization of American States-CIDA Working Relationship.

Shifter, Michael. The Shifting Landscape of Latin American Regionalism.

Canadian International Development Agency (September 2010). CIDA's Business Process RoadMap.

Canadian International Development Agency (June 2006). Responding To The Hemisphere's Political Challenges: Report of The Inter-American Dialogue Task Force on the Organization of American States.

Organization of American States (2011). *OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan - Financial Report: CIDA Civil Society Project* (2008-2010).

Canadian International Development Agency and Organization of American States. OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008 – 2011. Mid-Plan Update. Narrative Report.

Organization of American States (2011). OAS/CIDA Cooperation Plan :Specific Funds - Financial statements (July 10, 2008 to March 31, 2011).

Government of Canada (2009). Canada and the Americas: Priorities & Progress.

Canadian International Development Agency (2001-2002). Estimates. Part III – Report on Plans and Priorities.

Canadian International Development Agency (2006-2007). Estimates. Part III – Report on Plans and Priorities.

Canadian International Development Agency (2011). Statistical Report on International Assistance. Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

Jones, M (2007). Democracy in Latin America, Challenges And Solutions: Political Party And Party System Institutionalization And Women's Legislative Representation.

United Nations (2005). The Millennium Development Goals. A Latin American and Caribbean Perspective.

Organization of American States (2005-2010). Meeting the Challenges. The Role of the OAS in the Americas.

Organization of American States (2007). La Dimension Politica de la Gobernabilidad Democratica.

Organization of American States (2009). The Year in Review (2008).

OECD (2011). Development Aid at a Glance. Statistics by Region: America.

Programa de las Naciones Unidaspara el Desarrollo (2010). Nuestra Democracia.

United Nations Development Program (1998). Evaluation of the Governance Programme for Latin America and the Caribbean.

United Nations (2007). Draft regional programme document for Latin America and the Caribbean (2008-2011).

BAASTEL, Washington Consulting Corporation (March 2010). Evaluation of CIDA's Americas Branch Trade Program (BMI Portion) – Final Report.

UNIVERSALIA

5 .   L i s t   o f   C o n s u l t e d   P e o p l e

Name	Title	Organization
Organization of the American States		
Adam Blackwell	Secretary for Multidimensional Security (Former Canadian Ambassador)	Secretariat for Multidimensional Security
Alexandra Barrantes	Specialist	Department of Social Development and Employment
Alison August	Section Chief	Department of Public Security
Alvaro Briones	Advisor	Secretariat for Multidimensional Security
Ana Evelyn Jacir de Lovo	Director	Department of Social Development and Employment, Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI)
Andres Yi Chang	Specialist	Department of Social Development and Employment, Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI)
Araceli Azuara Ferreiro	Coordinator	Migration and Development Program, Executive Secretariat for Integral Development
Carmen Moreno	Executive Secretary	Inter-American Commission of Women
Cesar Parga	Senior Specialist	Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI)
Claudia Barrientos	Specialist	Department of Sustainable Democracy and Special Missions
Diego Moreno	Specialist	Department of International Law
Fernando Garcia	Specialist	Department of Public Security
Gaspar Travaglini	Specialist, Democracy Project	Office of the Secretary General
Gerald Anderson	Secretary	Secretariat for Administration and Finance
Hector Arduz	Advisor	Secretariat for Political Affairs
Hillary Anderson	Specialist	Permanent Secretariat of the Inter-American Commission of Women
Jane Thery	Senior Communications Advisor	Department of Strategic Communication and Image, Secretariat for External Relations
Jean Michael Arrighi	Secretary	Secretariat for Legal Affairs
John Wilson	Senior Specialist	Department of International Law
Jorge Saggiante	Executive Secretary	Executive Secretary for Integral Development
Jorge Sanin	Director	Relations with Permanent Observers & Civil Society Department of International Affairs | Secretariat for External Relations
Juan Jose Goldschtein	Director	Department of Information and Technology Services
Laura Martinez	Senior Specialist	Department of Legal Cooperation
Marcos Acle	Legal Officer	Department of Social Development and Employment, Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI)
Maria Antonieta Gaxiota	Director	Department of Human Resources, Secretariat for Administration and Finance

Name	Title	Organization
Maria Celina Conte	Specialist	Inter-American Commission of Women
Maria Claudia Pulido	Senior Specialist	Executive Secretariat of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
Maria Fernanda Trigo	Senior Specialist	Department of Sustainable Democracy and Special Missions
María Teresa Mellenkamp	Section Chief	Electoral Technical Cooperation Section, Department of Electoral Cooperation and Observation,
Marta Serrano	Specialist	Department for Effective Public Management
Maryse Robert	Chief	Trade Section
Miguel A. Porrúa	e-Government Senior Expert	Department for Effective Public Management, Secretariat for Political Affairs
Monica Villegas	Specialist	Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI)
Nicolas Monroy	Chief Administrative Management Section	Secretariat for Political Affairs
Pablo Zuniga	Senior Specialist	Department for Effective Public Management
Raúl Esparza	Consultant, PUICA Program	Department for Effective Public Management
Ricardo Dominguez	Chief of Staff of the SG	Office of the Secretary General
Ricardo Graziano	Director	Department of Planning and Evaluation
Robert Devlin	Director	Department for Effective Public Management
Rodrigo Cortes	Specialist	Department of Legal Cooperation
Rodrigo Zubieta	Specialist	Department of Sustainable Democracy and Special Missions
Sergio E. Martinez	Advisor	Office of the Secretary General
Sherry Tross	Director	Summits Secretariat
Steve Griner	Senior Specialist	Department for Effective Public Management
Theresa Wetter	Senior Specialist	Department of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism
Yacsire Cutler	Section Chief	Department of Planning and Evaluation (DPE), Secretariat for Administration and Finance
Zakaria El Goumiri	Specialist	Department of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism
OAS Permanent Missions		
Agustín Vásquez	Alternate Representative	Permanent Mission of El Salvador to the OAS
Asram Yahir Santino Soleyn	Counsellor	Permanent Mission of St. Vincent & the Grenadines to the OAS
Brett Maitland	Counsellor, Head of Cooperation	Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS
Luis Menéndez Castro	Ambassador	Permanent Mission of El Salvador to the OAS
Margarita Riva	Counsellor, Alternate Representative	Permanent Mission of the United States to the OAS
Néstor Méndez	Ambassador	Permanent Mission of Belize to the OAS
Nicola Alice Victoria Virgill-Rolle	Alternate Representative	Permanent Mission of Bahamas to the OAS

Name	Title	Organization
Pierre Giroux	Deputy Head of Mission	Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS
CIDA Staff Members		
Annick Amyot	Senior Development Officer (OAS, PAHO, IACHR, IIN)	Strategic Analysis, Operations and Regional Programming Division (SAORP), Americas
Brigitte d'Aoust	Program Manager	Inter-American Program, Americas Branch
Darren Rogers	Senior Development Officer	Colombia Program
Gaetane Pouliot	Program Manager, Colombia	Colombia Program
Julian Murray	Senior Director	Strategic Analysis, Operations and Regional Programming, OAS
Léa Beaudry	Governance Director	Governance Directorate
Lise Filiatrault	Regional Director General	Geographic Programs Branch

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 xxxxxxxxxxxx? 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?

15) What are the key implications of OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan 2008-2011 findings, conclusions and lessons learned for GS/OAS's future directions? Programming? Partnerships?

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 <u>yes</u> and under what conditions <u>no</u>? 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* <u>since approximately 2008</u>. I am referring to the <u>services</u> of the GS, not the nature of the substantive role played – for example, degree of <u>preparation</u> 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 <u>better, about the same, or inferior</u> to those provided <u>prior to 2008</u>? 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)

Project	Relevance	Effects	Sustainability

4) Is there any aspect of the OAS-CIDA Cooperation Plan we have not discussed and that you would like to comment on?