**ANNEX 1 - TERMS OF REFERENCE**

# **Name of the Assignment:**

Assessment of the Effectiveness of Policy Communication instruments

# **Context and background information**

The International Center for Human Development (ICHD) in partnership with UNDP Armenia, OxYGen Armenia, Westminster Foundation for Democracy and financial support of the governments of the UK and Swede, is implementing a multi-actor project on “Modern Parliament for a Modern Armenia” project (hereinafter Project) for improving quality of legislative oversight and policy-making in Armenia since mid-2019.

In the framework of the Project UNDP Armenia and ICHD aim at enhancing capacities of the legislature to analyze, draft and amend legislation, in particular, via delivering capacity development and coaching programmes to the NA.

# **Purpose, objectives and scope**

To this end, ICHD mobilises expertise to conduct an assessment of the effectiveness of policy communication instruments. The assessment will concentrate on the best practices of ICHD in this area that utilise their tailored state-of-the art instruments of policy communication and multi-stakeholder facilitated policy dialogue, specifically the ICHD’s Off-the Record (OTR) discussions (policy discussions based on Chatham House rules and localised protocols) followed by two-pager policy briefs and ICHD’s town hall meetings (THMs). The assessment will focus on *case studies* and will be available in Armenian and English in the format of an electronic publication.

ICHD will solicit services of an Expert on Policy Communication and Instruments to conduct the assessment.

# **Working approach and methodology**

Under the overall technical supervision and guidance of the Senior Research and Development Specialist and in close cooperation with the ICHD team, the Expert on Policy Communication and Instruments will accomplish the following tasks and will provide relevant key deliverables:

* Conduct desk study of the ICHD practices and instruments of policy communication and multi-stakeholder facilitated policy dialogue (OTRs, PBs, THMs and their analytical reports).
* Review highlights in media related to the response of the policy makers to the ICHD PBs and THM analytical reports, including the responses of the MPs and the decision-makers of the intra-parliament institutions, and select illustrative 2-3 cases to be presented in the Report.
* Review official documents to reveal the reflection of the conclusions and recommendations voiced in the ICHD PBs and THM analytical reports supported by the evidence of causal links between the recommendations and decisions-made.
* Conduct semi-structured interviews with the representatives of the policy community to complement the data and findings of the desk study and media review (interviews with the relevant respondents at the National Assembly may be also considered).
* Develop a Draft Report in Armenian and submit to ICHD: it should contain an executive summary, the main report (should not exceed 30 pages) and annexes as necessary (this ToR is an integral part of the Report and will be provided in an annex, as well as the list of experts interviewed, other annexes whenever appropriate, abbreviations and acronyms).
* Develop a Final Report incorporating the feedback received from ICHD.
* Participate in discussions as requested by ICHD.

Below are the key assessment questions that the Report will either answer explicitly or will provide evidence-base for further assessment in the context of improving the effectiveness of the policy communication instrument for the use of the National Assembly of RA.

**Evaluation Question**: To what extent are the policy communication instruments effective in facilitating the use of research or evidence in the public policy process?

* To what extent were the instruments helpful for the policy makers, who move in restricted contexts for decision-making (especially regarding time), in providing evidence and action recommendations in a brief and simple manner?
* In which stage(s) of the public policy process ICHD seek to influence through the instruments? What key players were entailed in each stage of the process? Was the problem to be addressed clearly identified? Was it possible to summarize it in a “few lines”? Is there enough evidence to back up the relevance of the problem stated and the possible ways to address it?
* To what extent were the titles of the policy communication instruments attractive? Did they describe the content of the instruments concisely and attractively (e.g., describe the issue in question and relevance)? Were they clear and concise? Were they interesting and relevant for potential readers?
* Did the policy communication instruments provide an executive summary to the audience? Was the executive summary the synthesis of the communication instrument? Did it must allow the readers to have a complete and fair understanding of the content of the communication? Did they provide an opportunity to attract the interest of the audience? Did they clearly reflect the objectives of the communication instruments? Did they define and describe the problem addressed, and concisely evaluate the alternatives and submit the main conclusions or recommendations?
* To what extent the instruments defined and explained an urgent political issue while addressing a policy issue? Was this explanation useful to decision makers? To what extent it was utilized?
* To what extent did the policy communication instruments “establish the political scene”? Did they center on the direct context of the problem analyzed? Was the situation described in relation to those affected by the problem being analyzed? Was the stage of public policies on which the analysis or the recommendation is centered described?
* Have the policy communication instruments schematized viable policy options that could address the issue being addressed and its possible consequences? Were these policy options voiced by the decision makers?
* Have the instruments produced information about the possible outcome of the implementation of certain courses of action by means of a research evidence analysis? Was the information submitted in such a way that the relevant knowledge and the data necessary as evidence legitimated the argument proposed? Was the information produced disseminated and/or used by the decision makers publicly?
* Were the instruments used to provide the decision makers with a summary of the diagnosis and the principal positions on the problem addressed? Have the instruments used summarized the core of the problem to make a recommendation on public policy?
* To what extent was the argumentation based on practical or theoretical knowledge, and effective? Have the arguments established clearly what is meant to say and to whom? Were the arguments consistent and coherent, and thus, credible? Were the augments built on values, metaphors, experiences, narratives or comparisons? Was the argumentation short and easy to understand?
* Have the instruments recommended a policy alternative and state the reasons why it is better than other alternatives? Has the provided description of the problem and viable policy options based on evidence added credibility to the recommendations and allowed for a more informed assessment of the options by the decision makers? Did the recommendations reveal ICHD’s position? Were they in line with the definition of the problem? Have the conclusions and/or recommendations included a concise synthesis of the most relevant findings based on evidence? Were the practical steps necessary to implement a policy option introduced? Has the feasibility of the proposal been shown and those who should promote the initiative determined? Has the instruments described what should happen afterwards? Were the recommendations presented in a scalable manner (short, mid, and long term)? Were the recommended policy alternatives utilized by the decision makers?
* To what extent has the content design attracted the readers and improved their access to the information provided in the communication instruments? Were the policy communication instruments accessible to the audience?
* Were the specific policy instruments accompanied by other communication actions by different stakeholders, such as an effective coverage in the press, to give the problem addressed in the brief and the perspectives proposed in it more visibility in the political agenda? Has such communication influenced the decision making?