



## EC/UN Partnership on Gender Equality for Development and Peace

**--Re-Advertisement--**

### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR FINAL EVALUATION EC/UN PARTNERSHIP ON GENDER EQUALITY FOR DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE

- ✓ **Recruitment Type: Team of consultants / Organization**
- ✓ **Contract Type: Professional Services Contract**
- ✓ **Location: Home-based with some travel**
- ✓ **Date of Start: 1 July 2010**
- ✓ **End Date: 30 September 2010**
- ✓ **Duration of the Consultancy: 66 days**

#### 1. BACKGROUND OF PROGRAMME OR ISSUE ADDRESSED BY PROGRAMME

The 10-year review of the Beijing Platform for Action (New York, 2005) affirmed that commitments to gender equality were not matched by concerted or consistent implementation. In particular, commitments to gender equality, including the BPFA, CEDAW and SCR 1325<sup>1</sup>, have not been matched by financial support by national government budgets or through official development assistance.

Past years have seen a considerable reshaping of the structures and financing of development cooperation and support for peace and security initiatives; efforts to promote gender equality take place in the context of this changing aid architecture. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, adopted in March 2005, reflects the changing nature of aid as increasingly driven by partnership between donor and recipient countries, and ownership of the development process by the recipients of aid.

These shifts have raised important questions about implementation and the accountability of all development actors. At the national and international policy levels, they pose new challenges and present new opportunities for reaching internationally-agreed development objectives, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Too often gender equality is absent from or marginal in the new coordination mechanisms that include, among others, general budget support (GBS), basket funds, Sector Wide Approaches (SWAPs) and Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs), multi-donor trust funds, integrated missions and needs assessments, and Consolidated Appeals (CAPs).

---

<sup>1</sup> Beijing Platform for Action (BPFA), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and United Nations' Security Council Resolution 1325 (SCR 1325).

The new aid environment has now brought in new impetus for gender advocates to demonstrate and provide tools on how donors and governments can incorporate stronger commitment to gender equality in the aid effectiveness mechanisms. Additionally, it is necessary to provide strategies to ensure that post conflict priority setting and resource allocation takes into account provisions of SCR 1325.

In this manner, the European Commission (EC), the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), and the International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization (ITC-ILO) are partnering to implement the programme: **EC/UN Partnership on Gender Equality for Development and Peace**. The overall aim of this three-and-a-half-year programme (2007-2010) is “to ensure that gender equality and women’s human rights are fully incorporated into national development processes and in those cooperation programmes which are supported by the European Commission (EC)”. The programme also includes a focus on effective implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (SCR 1325), adopted in 2000 to mainstream gender equality and women’s empowerment in responses to conflict and post-conflict situations.

## **2. JUSTIFICATION AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

This will be an independent, summative, and final evaluation. It is a mandatory evaluation required as per agreement with the European Commission. It will be undertaken at the end of a 3-year programme’s implementation with the intention of determining if the programme was able to achieve its stated objectives and expected changes. It will therefore be an output and outcome evaluation as it pursues to determine in the first place, the efficiency of its intervention (*Were the services/interventions delivered in a timely manner?*), and secondly, to establish whether it achieved its intended results (*Did the programme make a difference?*). In addition to identifying results, the aim of the evaluation is to draw lessons and recommendations for future action (replication and/or upscaling) in this field for UNIFEM, the EC, ITC/ILO and diverse stakeholders. As an independent/external evaluation, evaluation experts will be hired to assess the programme interventions while ensuring credibility of the findings. Finally, UNIFEM will coordinate and manage the evaluation. It will be a decentralized evaluation as the process will be led by the Cross Regional Programmes (CRP) Unit in close consultation with the Evaluation Unit.

The objectives of the final evaluation are:

1. To assess and validate the results of the programme in terms of achievements/gaps in delivering outputs, contributing to outcomes, reaching target and beneficiaries groups.
2. To analyze the effectiveness of the overall strategy and approaches of the programme, such as for example, its multi-stakeholder approach, the regional-national linkages, capacity building, partnerships, and knowledge generation and dissemination.
3. To analyze lessons learned (identifying strengths and weaknesses) on both substantive and programme management issues that will inform future programmatic work and EC-UNIFEM partnership.
4. To provide inputs/forward looking recommendations for a next phase or a new programme on gender and aid effectiveness.
5. To assess existing or missing conditions for sustainability of programme interventions and results.

Thus, the information provided by the evaluation will have diverse uses for different stakeholders:

- **For the EC**, to draw lessons on how to influence EC policy dialogue and international high-level policy dialogue on aid effectiveness; and at country level, on how EU Delegations (EUD) can ensure that gender is mainstreamed in its work.
- **For UNIFEM**, to provide evidence on effective ways to move forward the implementation of gender equality commitments at national level by ensuring that gender equality is integrated in aid delivery mechanisms and national planning, budgeting, and monitoring and evaluation; and to inform the direction of the new global programme on financing for gender equality, currently under design.
- **For ITC/ILO**, on the use and impact of training materials and communication resources strategies developed in the context of the programme.
- **For gender advocates**, to provide them with information on better strategies and results to guide their advocacy work at national and global levels, specifically, in view of the upcoming HLF-4 (Seoul 2011).
- **For national partners** (government, donors, and CSOs), to inform them on the effectiveness of the strategies adopted by the programme; provide them with information on lessons learned from different countries, and promote south-south learning.

### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE EC/UN PARTNERSHIP

The programme's main objective is to ensure that gender equality and women's human rights are fully incorporated into national development processes and in those cooperation programmes which are supported by the European Commission. The programme also includes a focus on effective implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1325, adopted in 2000 to mainstream gender equality and women's empowerment in responses to conflict and post-conflict situations.

Its specific objectives are:

1. To incorporate stronger commitments to gender equality-- in line with CEDAW, the Beijing PFA (BPFA), and the MDGs, in EC-supported programming processes and their revisions (e.g. through the so-called mid-term reviews) in 12 countries-- including in aid effectiveness mechanisms such as National Development Strategies (NDSs) and Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs).
2. To develop tools for EC-supported programmes (including Sector Wide Programmes and Budget Support) in 12 countries that incorporate stronger commitments to gender equality.
3. To enhance national and regional action to ensure mainstreaming of Security Council Resolution 1325 into conflict prevention and peace-building initiatives in four countries and relevant sectors supported through EC cooperation.
4. To mobilize multi-stakeholder groups from at least eight countries in order to secure greater commitment to gender equality at the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (Ghana HLF 2008).

This is a two-phased programme focusing on building capacity and accountability for mainstreaming gender equality in the aid effectiveness agenda and stepping up implementation and accountability for Security Council Resolution 1325. The first phase of implementation initiated in April 2007 and concluded with the Ghana HLF-3 in September 2008. The second phase builds on gains and gaps identified in Phase I to continue to strengthen implementation and accountability mainly at country level (from October 2008 to April 2010).

The programme seeks to achieve its objectives through the following strategic areas of action:

- **Development of a knowledge, an evidence base and tools** on the gender dimensions of the aid effectiveness agenda (i.e. mapping studies on Gender and Aid Effectiveness, best-practice summaries, studies on implementation of SCRs 1325, and training modules - developed by ITC/ILO).
- **Capacity building on Gender and Aid Effectiveness, GRB, and SCR 1325** in governments, donors, CSOs and gender advocates through on-line and face-to-face training.
- **Provision of technical support** to ministries to mainstream gender in Direct Budget Support (DBS), SWAPs, Basket Funds, National Action Plans for PD and AAA, SCR 1325 implementation, and key national and sectoral policies.
- **Dialogue and coordination among multiple stakeholders** (donors, government, CSOs, and other) – developing and maintaining mechanisms of dialogue to influence policy, programming, and monitoring of indicators from a gender perspective.
- **Advocacy at global, regional and national levels** - to influence HLF-3 and national policy processes.
- Development and monitoring of **gender-sensitive indicators** to follow up on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the AAA in accordance to GE commitments under CEDAW, BPfA, and MDGs.
- Influencing **EC policy and programming** at global and country levels
- Supporting a stronger implementation of **SCR 1325** in the context of aid effectiveness.
- **Communication and knowledge dissemination strategies** at global, regional and national level (through an interactive website, on-line resources, help desks, communities of practices, and other forms of dissemination).

In addition to interventions at the global and regional level, the programme also has interventions at the national level in 12 pilot countries in four regions as follow:

- **Africa:** Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, and Ghana
- **LAC:** Honduras, Nicaragua, and Suriname
- **Asia Pacific:** Indonesia, Nepal, and Papua New Guinea (PNG)
- **CIS:** Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine

The programme's duration is of 3 ½ years (April 2007 – September 2010). The original timeframe was 36-months (April 2007 – March 2010) months; however a *No-Cost Extension* for 6-months was approved by the EC. The new official end date is September 2010 (implementation ending in April 2010, followed by the Final Evaluation until September 2010), for a total of 42 months.

The total programme's budget is **€5,180,281**. The EC contribution is **€ 2,955,000** in cash; followed by a UNIFEM in cash and in-kind contribution of €2,157,671, and an ITC/ILO's in-kind contribution of €67,410.

The programme is based on a 3-party partnership between:

- The **European Commission (EC)** as main donor,
- The **United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)** as main implementing partner,
- The **International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization (ITC/ILO)**, also as implementing partners of specific components (see Annex 1 for more information on cooperation partners).

The programme management structure is composed of:

- At UNIFEM HQ level (in New York): Programme Manager, Programme Specialist, and Financial Analyst, provides technical guidance and oversee all programme activities.
- At country level: 12 National Project Coordinators (NPC), one in each pilot country, implements country activities under the management of UNIFEM Subregional Offices (SROs).
- Steering Committee: including EC-HQ, ITC/ILO and UNIFEM (Brussels Office, and Programme Manager). Meets at least twice a year. Provides advice to Programme Manager and make major programme decisions.

Programme stakeholders are:

- **At global level:** women's networks, international NGOs, regional intergovernmental organizations, and OECD-DAC gendernet.
- **At national level:** donor community (bilateral and multilateral donors, other members of UN Country Teams including gender theme groups); government (National Women's Machineries, Ministries of Finance and Planning, Sectoral or Line Ministries, Parliaments, Judiciaries and law enforcement, Police and military staff), Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), women's organizations and gender advocates - including women's conflict-prevention and peace networks, and other (academia, actors in conflict mediation and recovery processes - including assessment missions, the media, etc.).

The programme is linked to the work of other programme implementing partners (national partners and UN agencies) in different ways. For example, in several countries the work is coordinated with UNCT's work. Also, the Programme's work is connected to Donor Gender Groups and Multi-stakeholders' groups and with other EC Programmes at country level. Furthermore, it is linked to another UN/EC programmes on GRB and Aid Effectiveness.

#### **4. THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The scope of the evaluation will be delimited by three dimensions: timeframe, geographic and thematic focus:

- **Timeframe covered:** the evaluation will cover the whole implementation period (1 April 2007 to 31 April 2010<sup>2</sup> - 3 years).

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that some activities have continued beyond April 2010. Whenever possible, they can be included within the evaluation scope.

- **Geographic scope:** the 12 pilot countries will be covered, plus the global and regional components. Nevertheless, travel will be limited to 6 countries. Countries to be visited will be selected according to the following criteria: i) regional balance (at least 1 country per region) and ii) inclusion of stable and fragile or post conflict contexts; and iii) a combination of places where the implementation could be considered “strong” and “difficult”. Based on these criteria, the six countries are: **Cameroon, Ghana, Indonesia, PNG, Kyrgyzstan, and Honduras**. This proposal will be reviewed by the Evaluators and reconfirmed by the Core Reference Group during the inception phase.
- **Thematic scope:** the evaluation will cover all areas of focus or components of the programme as indicated in the project document. Combining the thematic and geographic focus, the evaluation should produce an overview per country of what was achieved in each country in the different areas of focus, identifying factors of success and challenges (external and internal to the programme). The evaluation should include an analysis of the role of different stakeholders (including programme partners – UNIFEM, the EC and ITC/ILO).

As part of the programme, a **Mid-Term Review** was undertaken in October 2008. This independent external evaluation, held at the end of Phase I, provided recommendations to improve the management and the technical focus of the programme. Those recommendations were taken into consideration during the second phase of implementation.

## EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The following is an initial battery of questions to be answered by the evaluation. It will be refined with the evaluators during the inception phase. They have been classified according to five evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact):

### Relevance:

- Are the programme objectives addressing identified rights and needs of the target group(s) in national, regional and global contexts? How much does the programme contribute to shaping women’s rights priorities in accordance to CEDAW, BPfA, SCRs 1325/1820/1880/1889, MDGs, and with UNIFEM’s Global Strategic Plan?
- Do the programme activities address the problems identified?
- Is the programme design articulated in a coherent structure? Is the definition of goal, outcomes and outputs clearly articulated and were these achievable?
- Has the second phase of the programme built on the recommendations of the mid-term review to improve programme management, implementation and results?

### Effectiveness:

- How did the outputs (specific programme actions) have led to outcomes? (Confirm the validity of the theory of change).
- Measure effectiveness/impact of programme strategies or areas of focus or outputs (knowledge/evidence-base building, communication and dissemination strategy, advocacy, capacity building, gender-sensitive indicators, multi-stakeholders groups, technical assistance for gender mainstreaming, and engendering EC policy and programming) considered separately and together.
- As a result of the programme activities:

- How did the programme influence the EC's position on aid effectiveness towards the HLF-3 and OECD-DAC discussions at global level, and also at programmatic level in the 12 pilots? (Can a stronger commitment to gender equality in line with CEDAW, BPfA, MDGs be identified as a result of the programme?) How did the programme influence and/or complement the work of other donors - such as DFID's?
- Have the EC position on and MDGs at global level and dialogue and development cooperation programmes in the 12 pilots incorporated?
- Is there an increased demand and supply for better aligning commitments to achieve gender equality with the aid effectiveness agenda both in stable and fragile/post conflict states?
- Is there an increased awareness on the way in which SCR 1325 (and 1820, 1888, and 1889) is being implemented and funded in four of the pilots (PNG, DRC, Indonesia and Nepal)?
- Have mainstream actors such as government decision makers, staff in line ministries, and parliamentarians, increased their demands for inclusion of support for gender equality in the assistance provided by the EC and other donors?
- Have gender advocates and women's rights networks enhance their capacity to engage in policy dialogue that will secure greater attention to gender equality? Have they been able to generate demand from mainstream governmental actors for them to provide their expertise in national development planning, including in conflict-prevention and peace-building activities?
- Have bilateral and multilateral actors increased their capacity and willingness to align themselves in support of national priorities for gender equality with mainstream national development processes?
- What are the changes produced by the programme on legal and policy frameworks at the national and regional level?
- How have participants to training provided through on-line and face-to-face methods used the knowledge acquired in their countries? How has the knowledge gained by individuals impacted the institutions they work for? (Distinguish impact of training on individuals and institutions).

**Efficiency:**

- What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used?
- Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner?
- Could the activities and outputs been delivered with fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity?
- Have UNIFEM's organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme? (How well was the programme managed?; Assess the adequacy of the monitoring and reporting mechanisms)
- Assess the quality of the partnership between UNIFEM and the EC in terms of efficiency and effectiveness (both at global and national level): How did the programme management structure work in terms of communication, processes? Did the partnership help optimizing time and resources while enhancing the achievement of results? (Draw good practices and weaknesses of the partnership and recommendations for future programming).
- Did the EC organizational structure (global/national levels), internal communications, and institutional arrangements (regarding the level of involvement of EU Delegations) for this particular programme effectively support the partnership and delivery of the program?

- Regarding other institutional arrangements for execution and implementation of the 12 pilots, assess:
  - The adequacy of the government commitment to the programme; and extent to which national expertise and resources have been used;
  - Whether stakeholders have a sense of ownership of the programme;
  - The efforts made by the partner institutions to ensure participation of different stakeholders in the implementation process and extent of their participation; and
  - Whether there were any conflicts of interest among stakeholders, and if so, the steps taken to resolve these conflicts.

**Sustainability:**

- What is the likelihood that the benefits from the programme will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time if the programme were to cease?
- Is the programme supported by national/local institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue to work with the programme or replicate it?
- What operational capacity of national partners, also known as capacity resources, such as technology, finance, and staffing, has been strengthened?
- What adaptive or management capacities of national partners, such as learning, leadership, programme and process management, networking and linkages have been supported?
- Do partners have the financial capacity to maintain the benefits from the programme?
- What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the sustainability of programme results? Is there evidence of interest or concrete plans for upscaling or replication of successful experiences?

**Impact:**

- To what extent the programme has contributed to the incorporation of gender equality and women's right into national development process and in cooperation programmes supported by the EC?
- To what extent can the changes that have occurred as a result of the programme be identified and measured?
- To what extent can the identified changes be attributed to the programme?

**5. METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION APPROACH**

The evaluation methodology will be developed by the Evaluation Team (see Section 6 for composition of team) and presented for approval to the Evaluation Task Manager/Core Reference Group. The methodology should use a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods that are appropriate to address the main evaluation questions. These methods should be applied with respect of human rights and gender equality, and facilitate the engagement of key stakeholders, particularly marginalized and vulnerable groups.

The methodology should: i) specify the approach to address the purposes of the evaluation and the evaluation questions -including an **evaluation matrix** with key evaluation criteria, questions, indicators, and sources of information); ii) determine the **instruments and methods** to gather relevant information

and data; (e.g. document review, phone and face-to-face interviews, focus groups, surveys, site visits, etc.). It should also include the review of a **wide range of information sources** (e.g. documents, filed information, institutional information systems, financial records, and a variety of key informants<sup>3</sup> - UNIFEM staff, donors (including), partners (the EC-HQ, EUDs, and ITC/ILO), gender experts, government officials, civil society groups, and beneficiaries (the 12 National Coordinators will submit a matrix with a stake holders analysis per country); iv) the **approaches for the analysis and interpretation** of data; v) the **communication and reporting strategies** of evaluation results; and vi) a **work plan** – indicating timing of activities and resources.

An **evaluability assessment** of the programme has been undertaken and is available for the evaluation team's review. Regarding the programme design, a theory of change is not clearly stated in the project document (prodoc). However, the prodoc does make an implicit link in proposing that by strengthening national dialogue among diverse partners, building capacity and generating gender-sensitive data, gender equality will be better integrated in national development processes and delivery of Official Development Assistance (ODA). In addition, some gaps in the results chain logic can be found in the prodoc (between objectives, outcomes, outputs and inputs). Some work to strengthen the coherence between them is needed. There is no baseline available, but mapping studies undertaken as an initial activity provided diagnostic data on aid flows in the 12 countries. Evaluators are recommended to assess the appropriateness of the indicators proposed in the logic framework. Finally, in terms of programme information availability, at global level, there are 3 annual reports, 2 monitoring reports (process oriented), and knowledge products. Most of the programme documentation can be found at [www.gendermatters.eu](http://www.gendermatters.eu), and from the CRP Unit and the 12 country offices.

*The proposed approach and methodology has to be considered as flexible guidelines rather than final standards; and the evaluators will have an opportunity to make their inputs and propose changes in the evaluation design. It is expected that the selected Evaluation Team will further refine the approach and methodology and submit their detailed description in the proposal and Inception Report.*

## 6. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION

This independent evaluation will be managed the Cross Regional Programmes (CRP) Unit with the technical support and guidance from UNIFEM's Evaluation Unit in HQ. The CRP Unit Programme Specialist for the EC/UN Partnership will serve as Evaluation Task Manager and is responsible for managing the day to day aspects of the evaluation process. In addition, there will be two consultative bodies which will support the evaluation process:

- **Core Reference Group:** this group will be in charge of the direct management of the evaluation. At the technical level, this group will provide technical feedback and support essential decision making during the whole evaluation process. It will prepare the TORs; participate in the selection of the evaluation team; provide feedback to all technical products submitted by the evaluation team; prepare the management response and disseminate findings; and safeguard the independence of the evaluation. At the operational level, this group will be responsible for: recruitment of evaluation team; contractual arrangements and payments; provision of limited administrative support and

---

<sup>3</sup> The consultants can raise or discuss any issue or topic they deem necessary to fulfil the tasks. The Consultants, however, are not authorized to make any commitments to any party on behalf of UNIFEM.

required data to the evaluators; making linkages between the evaluation team and senior management and other relevant stakeholders. It will be constituted by:

- Evaluation Task Manager (Programme Specialist), CRP Unit
  - Programme Manager, CRP Unit
  - Programme/Finance Assistant, CRP Unit
  - Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Unit, UNIFEM
  - 1 Representative per geographic region assigned by the Geo Section in consultation with the participating SROs (responsible for the 12 pilot projects).
- **Broad Reference Group:** this group will be informed throughout the evaluation process and will be requested feedback on key steps: comments to the main conceptual considerations of the TORs (the key objectives, questions and scope of the evaluation), the inception report and evaluation reports, and on dissemination of findings. Programme partners might be requested to provide planning documents, mission reports or other relevant documents. It will be represented by the:
    - Evaluation Task Manager (Programme Specialist) and Programme Manager, CRP Unit
    - Four Section Chiefs, Geo Sections, UNIFEM HQ
    - Regional Programme Directors (RPDs) of participating UNIFEM Subregional Offices (SROs) for the 12 pilots
    - EC HQ (Dominique Dellicour, Head of Unit, Elena Volpi, Specialist, and Cristina Soriani, Finance)
    - ITC/ILO (Benedetta Magri, Activity Manager)
    - All NPCs for the 12 Pilots – NPCs will consult as necessary with the existing multi-stakeholder’s groups (comprised by donors –including the ECDs, government and CSOs representatives - *NPCs will fill up the stakeholders analysis matrix*).
    - Women’s networks at global level (ex. GENDERNET, WIDE, and NETRIGHT)

This is a participatory evaluation with a strong learning component. For the preparation of this TOR, an initial identification of key stakeholders at national and regional levels has been conducted in order to analyze their involvement in the evaluation process. The management of the evaluation will ensure that key stakeholders are consulted.

The Evaluation Team, through its Team Leader, will report directly to the Evaluation Task Manager, who will share progress and products with the established reference groups.

After the completion of the evaluation, a final stage will include the elaboration of: i) a **dissemination strategy** for sharing evaluation findings and lessons learnt; and ii) a **management response** to address evaluation recommendations. These activities will be managed by the Evaluation Task Manager in close consultation with Core Reference Group.

The Evaluation Task Manager or other members of the Core Reference Group may participate in the country missions in collaboration with the evaluation team.

## 7. TIMEFRAME AND PRODUCTS

The evaluation will be conducted between July and September 2010.

The evaluation will be conducted in **4 stages** – an inception stage; a comprehensive; country field visits, and a final overall analysis stage to draft the final evaluation report:

- **Stage 0 – Inception phase** involves an initial desk review and interviews with the key stakeholders to define the scope of the evaluation and refine the evaluation questions. It will result in an inception report with the development of detailed work plan, methodology for gathering and analyzing the data, and the criteria for the selection of countries. The evaluators will meet with the Core Reference Group and key stakeholders at the global level.
- **Stage 1 – Comprehensive study** covers a thorough desk review of all relevant documentation and completion of interviews with key stakeholders at global and regional levels.
- **Stage 2 – Country field visits** involve field visits to 5 countries, review of corresponding case studies documentation; and drafting of preliminary evaluation findings and reports, including country reports.
- **Stage 3 – Overall analysis** will focus on the data analysis, including the preparation of the final evaluation report.

As part of the inception phase, a workshop will be organized and facilitated by the evaluation team to review and discuss with the programme team the intervention's internal and external logic and results as well as the information availability and the programme's context. Inputs from this workshop will feed the evaluation design.

In addition, at least one member of the evaluation team (preferably the Team Leader) will:

- Attend the Closing Event for the EC/UN Partnership to take place in Turin, Italy on July 5 and 6, 2010. This workshop will be a learning event where NPCs, national stakeholders and programme partners will reflect on programme results and lessons learned, as well as on future steps in the work on gender and aid effectiveness. This event will represent an opportunity for the Evaluation Team to share the Inception Report, and collect data from key programme stakeholders.
- Meet the EC at HQ level (in Brussels) before or after the Turin Workshop on 5 and 6 July 2010.

These research phases will be linked to specific deliverables to be submitted by the Evaluation Team, as follows:

1. **An inception report** which contains evaluation objectives and scope, description of evaluation methodology/methodological approach, data collection tools, data analysis methods, key informants/agencies, evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan and reporting requirements. It should include a clear evaluation matrix relating all these aspects.
2. **Power point presentation** of preliminary findings to the key stakeholders. The comments made by key stakeholders should inform the draft report.
3. **Draft evaluation report** highlighting key evaluation findings and conclusions, lessons and recommendations. The format of the evaluation report will be agreed with the evaluators.
4. **Final evaluation report** which should follow the proposed structure:
  - Executive Summary (maximum five pages)

- Programme description
- Evaluation purpose
- Evaluation methodology
- Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations and Lessons learnt
- Annexes (including interview list – without identifying names for sake of confidentiality/ anonymity, data collection instruments, key documents consulted, Terms of Reference).
- **Note:** Include a section with country profiles that summarized evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations by country.

Deliverables are to be written in **English** and submitted to the Evaluation Task Manager in the due date, as per the following timeframe:

**Table: Evaluation Timeline**

Activity	Product	Number of days (Approx)	Jul 2010	Aug 2010	Sep 2010
Initial desk review by evaluation team Detailed evaluation planning; consultations with UNIFEM (Core Reference Group, and other relevant units in HQ and field); as basis for the inception report	<b>Inception report</b> of the evaluation team which includes the evaluation methodology and the timing of activities and deliverables	10	By July 10		
Attend EC/UN Partnership Closing Workshop (Turin, July 5-6). This will be an opportunity to share the inception report and obtain key information from programme stakeholders. Include a visit to EC HQ in Brussels before or after Turin.		5	July 5-6		
Debriefing of UNIFEM HQ (Core Reference Group), prior to departure of evaluation team Data collection: additional desk review, simultaneous field visits to 4 world regions, etc. Preparation and discussion of preliminary findings, lessons learned and recommendations between evaluation team, UNIFEM HQ (Core Reference Group)	<b>Power Point presentation</b> on preliminary findings, lessons learned, and recommendations	20	By July 31		
Drafting of full report (including country summaries) and five-page executive summary	<b>Draft full report</b> highlighting key evaluation findings	21		By August	

Drafting of full report (including country summaries) and five-page executive summary	<b>Draft full report</b> highlighting key evaluation findings and conclusions, lessons and recommendations. The format of the evaluation report will be agreed with the evaluators.	21		By August 20	
Review by Core and Broad Reference Groups	Written <b>feedback</b> to the evaluation team				By Sept 4
Finalizing the full report (including country summaries) and executive summary	<b>Final evaluation report</b> and five-page executive summary	10			By Sept 27

## 8. TEAM COMPOSITION, SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

The evaluation team would be composed of a team of experts: For example i) **A Team Leader:** international expert on gender and aid effectiveness, responsible for ensuring the quality of the overall evaluation; and iii) **four regional consultants**, with strong evaluation and data collection and analysis skills, who will collect the data simultaneously in each of the 4 programme regions; in addition to English, they will have knowledge of local languages. The evaluation team can hire local consultants to assist them in the data collection as needed. National consultants will be hired by evaluation team.

The team leader should demonstrate:

- (a) Solid expertise (knowledge of and experience) in gender and aid effectiveness, and gender equality and human rights;
- (b) Experience designing and leading evaluations;
- (c) Experience applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- (d) Data analysis skills;
- (e) Process management skills such as facilitation skills;
- (f) Detailed knowledge of the role of the UN and its programming is desirable;
- (g) Language proficiency in English a must;
- (h) International experience and knowledge of the countries included in this evaluation.

Thematic experts (regional consultants) should demonstrate:

- (a) Extensive knowledge of, and experience in evaluation: applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods; and in data analysis skills;
- (b) Process management skills such as facilitation skills;
- (c) Experience in gender analysis and human rights. Knowledge of the role and ways of working of both the UN and the EC is desirable;
- (i) Language proficiency in English (a must); knowledge of local languages it is an asset.
- (d) International experience and knowledge of the countries included in this evaluation.

Evaluation teams should be multicultural with gender balance and geographic representation.

The Evaluation Team should also provide examples of **two evaluation reports** recently completed in relevant fields when responding to the Terms of Reference.

*The evaluators will be responsible for their logistics: office space, administrative and secretarial support, telecommunications, printing of documentation, etc. The evaluation team is also responsible for the dissemination of all methodological tools such as surveys, but the Core Reference Group will facilitate this process to the extent possible by providing contact information such as email addresses and phone numbers.*

## **9. RECRUITMENT PROCESS**

Please send a Technical Proposal (5-pages maximum) which includes a financial proposal and the CVs of the Evaluation Team members to [unifem.crp@gmail.com](mailto:unifem.crp@gmail.com) by **Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> June 2010** 5pm US Eastern Time. Only pre-selected candidates will be notified (See Annex 2 for the criteria on how the Evaluation Teams and their proposals will be assessed).

## **10. ANNEXES**

- a. Annex 1: Information on the Programme Implementing Partners (UNIFEM and ITC/ILO)
- b. Annex 2: Criteria for Assessment of the Evaluation Team
- c. Annex 2: Evaluation Ethical Code of Conduct of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)

## **ANNEX 1: INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS (UNIFEM AND ITC/ILO)**

### **UNIFEM**

UNIFEM's thirty years of experience as the United Nations operational organization mandated to promote gender equality and women's human rights within the UN system and at country level will be brought to bear in this programme. UNIFEM's expertise in building country-level capacity in tools of accountability -- gender responsive budgeting, CEDAW monitoring and better use of sex-disaggregated data as a basis for gender-responsive policy formulation -- will be a critical contribution towards delivering on the EC's commitments to gender equality. UNIFEM's focus on four thematic areas -- reducing feminized poverty, ending violence against women, reducing the prevalence of HIV/AIDS amongst women and girls, and building gender equality in democratic governance -- will enhance its strategic engagement in supporting stronger action to secure and protect women's human rights.

UNIFEM's presence on the ground through its network of sub-regional and country project offices (including 15 sub-regional offices and approximately 20 project offices) in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Arab States, Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, and Latin America and the Caribbean enables a strong, country-based interface with all stakeholders, including decision-makers in line ministries, members of parliament, the media, trade unions, women's organizations and networks, as well as EC delegations. This facilitates UNIFEM's ability to provide technical support required by key actors whose responsibilities have increased and changed as a result of new mechanisms for aid delivery.

The EC and UNIFEM have been working closely together to facilitate dialogue on the new aid modalities among gender equality advocates, policy makers in partner countries and the donor community. The EC/UNIFEM consultation on "Owning Development: Promoting Gender Equality in New Aid Modalities and Partnerships", held in Brussels in November 2005 and the EC support to UNIFEM gender budgeting initiatives have brought about promising new approaches to assessing the gender implications of aid effectiveness. UNIFEM expanded this work through regional consultations for Africa, Asia and the Pacific and the Commonwealth of Independent States.

### **ITC/ILO**

With the aim of creating a critical mass of gender-aware people who are involved in policy formulation and project planning, the ITC/ILO Gender Coordination Unit integrates gender equality issues into all the Centre's training in two ways. Firstly, by bringing gender issues into the mainstream of the Centre's programmes, a network of gender focal points has been set up across the Centre to increase the visibility of gender issues and the number of women participants. Secondly, by running online and residential courses on specific gender issues.

In order to reinforce the capacity of EC staff and their immediate development partners to mainstream gender equality issues in all development operations: from up-stream policy dialogue with recipient countries, down to aid delivery and project implementation, the ITC/ILO and the EC jointly undertook the project "Methodological support (Manual) and Training on Gender Mainstreaming" (2004-2006). It was the first truly systematic effort to bridge the gap between policy and practice, more specifically at the concrete, operational level. In less than three years, the ITC/ILO/EC Gender Help Desk, developed a "EC Gender Toolkit", designed a tailor-made curriculum, developed training and information materials, developed a dedicated on-line learning platform and trained approximately 1100 people among EC staff, representatives of partner countries, NGOs, other donors, in Brussels and in EU Delegations in 25 countries in Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia and neighboring European countries.

## ANNEX 2: CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The selection of the Evaluation Team will be based on the fulfillment of the specifications established in the TOR. The submitted proposals will be assessed on three main categories: the expertise and competencies of the evaluators, as reflected in their CVs, gender balance and diversity of team; the technical proposal for the specific evaluation; and financial proposal. The categories will be assigned different weighting, which will total to 100 %.

### I. Team Composition (40%)

The team leader's and all team's experience and qualifications meet the criteria indicated in the TOR. The team is gender balanced and cross-culturally diverse.

### II. Technical proposal (40%):

1. **Evaluation matrix:** The matrix clearly addresses the TOR, relating evaluation *Questions* with evaluation *Criteria*, with *Indicators* and with *Means of verification*.
2. **Evaluation approach and methodology:** The proposal presents a specific approach and a variety of techniques for gathering and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data that are feasible and applicable in the timeframe and context of the evaluation, and incorporates human rights and gender equality perspectives.
3. **Work plan:** The timeframe and resources indicated in the work plan are realistic and useful for the needs of the evaluation.
4. **Motivation and ethics:** The evaluators reflect clear professional commitment with the subject of the assignment and follow UNEG ethical code of conduct.

### III. Budget (20 %)

The budget proposed is sufficient for applying the data gathering techniques and for obtaining reliable data for the evaluation in the timeframe indicated.

### ANNEX 3: ETHICAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE EVALUATION

It is expected that the evaluators will respect the ethical code of conduct of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). These are:

- **Independence:** Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgment is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- **Impartiality:** Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated.
- **Conflict of Interest:** Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise.
- **Honesty and Integrity:** Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behavior, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.
- **Competence:** Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.
- **Accountability:** Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.
- **Obligations to Participants:** Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented.
- **Confidentiality:** Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.
- **Avoidance of Harm:** Evaluators shall act to minimize risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.
- **Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability:** Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgments, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.
- **Transparency:** Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.
- **Omissions and wrongdoing:** Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.